


270.1
Sch1
1854
v.2

**THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY**

From the Library
of the
Diocese of Springfield
Protestant Episcopal
Church
Presented 1917

270.1
Schl
1854 v.2



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

<https://archive.org/details/historyofapostol02scha>

HISTORY
OF THE
APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

“The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field : which indeed is the least of all seeds : but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.”

“The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.”—JESUS CHRIST.

HISTORY
OF THE
APOSTOLIC CHURCH
WITH A
GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO CHURCH HISTORY.

BY
PHILIP SCHAFF,
PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT MERCERSBURG.

VOLUME SECOND.



EDINBURGH:
T. AND T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON,
AND HODGES AND SMITH.

MDCCCLIV.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

270.1

Sch 1

1857

V. 2

FOUNDING, SPREAD, AND PERSECUTION OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER IV.

LABOURS OF THE OTHER APOSTLES DOWN TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

§ 89. *Character of Peter.*

SIMON, as he was originally called, or, as he was afterwards named, PETER, was the son of the fisherman Jonas.¹ He was a native of Bethsaida in Galilee,² and a resident of Capernaum,³ where he followed his father's occupation. His brother Andrew, a disciple of John the Baptist, first brought him to Jesus, by whom he was called to be a fisher of men.⁴ After that miraculous draught of fishes, from which he received an overwhelming impression of power and majesty of the Lord, and by which he was awakened to a sense of his own weakness and sinfulness (Luke v. 3, *et seq.*), he surrendered himself wholly to the service of Christ, and became with John and the elder James, a confidant of his Master, and a witness of the transfiguration on Mount Tabor and the agony in Gethsemane. And in this triad itself he is plainly the most prominent personage. He is, in fact, the "organ of the whole college of apostles,"⁵ speaking and acting

¹ Matth. iv. 18; xvi. 17. John i. 42; xxi. 16.

² John i. 44.

³ Matth. viii. 14. Luke iv. 38.

⁴ Matth. iv. 18, *et seq.* Mark i. 16, *et seq.* John i. 41, *et seq.*

⁵ So Chrysostom styles him, *In Joann. homil.* 88, where he says of Peter: "Εκκρεῖτος ἢ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ στόμα τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ κορυφὴ τοῦ χοροῦ."

in their name. While the contemplative, reflecting John lay in mysterious silence on the Saviour's bosom, the more practical and energetic Peter could never conceal his inmost nature, but everywhere involuntarily exposed it.

Hence the gospels reveal him to us both in his virtues and his failings, more fully than they do any other apostle. With the most honest enthusiasm he gives himself up to Jesus, confessing, for all his colleagues, that He is the Messiah, the Son of the living God (Matth. xvi. 16). Soon after, with unbecoming familiarity and unconscious presumption, he undertakes to rebuke his Lord, and to dissuade him from the course of suffering which was necessary for the redemption of the world (Matth. xvi. 22). On the mount of transfiguration he proposes, under the impulse of the moment, to build tabernacles, and make sensuous provision for retaining the happiness he felt (Matth. xvii. 4). When Jesus was washing the disciples' feet, Simon, in high-minded modesty, presumed to know better than his Master: "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?" "Thou shalt never wash my feet" (John xiii. 6, 8). What a remarkable mixture of glowing love to Christ and rash self-reliance expresses itself in his vow shortly before the arrest in the garden: "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended!" . . . "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee!" (Matth. xxvi. 33, 35). How stormy and inconsiderate his carnal zeal in the garden of Gethsemane, where, instead of meekly suffering, he draws the sword! (John xviii. 10). And then ere long came his deep and grievous fall; fear of man and love of life making him unfaithful to his Master. But, in the hands of God, all this was the means of showing him his own weakness by bitter experience, humbling his heart, and teaching him to place his strength in the grace of God alone. The Lord did not forsake him. He prayed that his faith might not fail (Luke xxii. 31, 32);¹ restored him, after His resurrection, to the pastoral office, of which he had rendered himself unworthy by his apos-

¹ It is worthy of remark, that in this passage, according to the original, the faith of the other apostles seems to be made dependent on that of Peter. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have *you* (ὁμᾶς, which includes all the disciples), that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for *thee* (περὶ σοῦ, referring to Peter), that thy faith fail not; and when *thou* art converted, strengthen *thy brethren*."

tasy; and gave him charge of His sheep and lambs. The apostle had first, however, to be thoroughly tested by the thrice repeated question: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me—lovest thou me more than these?" The Lord would here humble and shame him, by reminding him of his thrice repeated denial of his Master, and of his self-exaltation above his fellow-disciples. Now his pride is broken, his ardour purified. He ventures no more to place himself above the rest, but submits the measure of his love to the Searcher of hearts; conscious that he loves his Lord, and recognising in this love the element of his life; but at the same time painfully sensible that he does not love Him as he ought, and as he gladly would (John xxi. 15, *et seq.*) That he allowed himself, even after this, to be hurried by momentary impulse into inconsistencies, is shown by the well-known occurrence at Antioch.¹ But he was doubtless enabled to improve this repeated disclosure of his weakness to his own humiliation, and ever kept in view the Lord's last prophetic words, that he should walk in the path of self-denial, and should finally complete his obedience and faithfulness by suffering a violent death (John xxi. 18, *et seq.*). For we elsewhere find him fearlessly confessing his faith before the people, before the council, and in the face of the greatest danger; steadfast in love to the Lord under toil and tribulation, even to the most excruciating martyrdom; and thus, after all, proving himself eminently worthy of his new name.²

This sketch of the life of Simon Peter gives us a picture of a remarkable combination of great natural talents and virtues with peculiar weaknesses. This apostle was distinguished from the other eleven by an ardent, impulsive, choleric, sanguine temperament, an open, shrewd, practical nature, bold self-confidence, prompt energy, and an eminent talent for representing and governing the church. He was always ready to speak out his mind and heart, to resolve, and to act. But these natural endowments brought with them a peculiarly strong temptation to vanity, self-conceit and ambition. His excitable impulsive disposition might very easily lead him to over-estimate his powers, to trust too much to himself, and, in the hour of danger, to yield with equal readiness to entirely opposite impressions. This

¹ Comp. § 70.

² Acts iii. 1-4, 22; v. 17-41; xii. 3-17.

explains his denial of his Lord, in spite of his usual firmness and joy in confessing his faith. In *depth* of knowledge and love he doubtless fell short of a Paul and a John, and hence was not so well fitted as they for the work of perfecting the church. His strength lay in the fire of immediate inspiration, in promptness of speech and action, and in an imposing *meinen*, which at once commanded respect and obedience. He was born to be a church leader, and his powers, after proper purification by the Spirit of Christ, admirably fitted him for the work of beginning, for the task of founding and organizing the church.

§ 90. *Position of Peter in Church History.*

What has now been said already indicates the place and significance of this apostle in the history of the church. His position was determined by his natural qualifications, so far as they were under the guidance of the Holy Ghost and enlisted for the truth. The Lord knew at once what was in him, and named him, at the outset, with reference to his future activity, *Cephas*, in the Aramaic language, or, as translated into Greek, *Peter*, signifying Rock.¹ A year afterwards, the Saviour confirmed and explained to him this title of honour, and connected with it that remarkable promise, which has been such an apple of discord in the history of the church. While others regarded Jesus as, at best, a forerunner of the Messiah, and therefore a mere man, however distinguished, Simon was the first to recognise and acknowledge, with his whole soul, and with the energy of living faith, the great central mystery, the fundamental article of Christianity, the Messiahship of his Master; the absolute union of the divine and the human, and the all-sufficient fulness of life, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. In a critical, sifting hour, when many were apostatizing, Simon declared, in the name of all his colleagues, from the depths of his inmost experience, and with the emphasis of the most assured and sacred conviction: "Thou art the Christ" (the Anointed of God, the long promised and anxiously expected Messiah), "the Son of the living God!"² Or, according to the somewhat more extended account of John: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou

¹ John i. 42. Mark iii. 16. ² Matth. xvi. 16. Comp. Mark viii. 29. Luke ix. 20.

hast the words of eternal life ; and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" (John vi. 66–69). On the ground of this first Christian creed, this joyful confession of saving faith, revealed to him not by flesh and blood (*i. e.*, neither by his own nature, nor by another man, as formerly by his brother Andrew, John i. 40, 41), but by the Father in heaven, the Lord pronounced him blessed, and added : "*Thou art Peter*" (rock, man of rock) ; "*and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*" (Matth. xvi. 18, 19). We have here an uncommonly significant play upon words, which we cannot feel the full force of without referring to the Greek, or, what is still better, the Hebrew original. Without doubt, our Lord used in both clauses the Aramaic word כֶּפֶס, (hence the Greek *κηφᾶς* applied to Simon, John i. 42 ; 1 Cor. i. 12 ; iii. 22 ; ix. 5 ; xv. 5 ; Gal. ii. 9).¹ In the Greek : σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, as also in the Latin : tu es *Petrus*, et super hanc *petram*,—the play on words is somewhat obscured by the necessary change of gender.² In the German and English it is wholly lost, since *Fels* and *rock* are never used as proper names. But in the French : Tu es *Pierre*, et sur cette *pierre* je bâtirai mon église,—it is brought out as clearly as in the Semitic dialects.

In the interpretation of this passage, two errors are to be avoided. On the one hand, the promise must not be sundered

¹ Hence the old Syraie translation, the Peshito, renders the passage in question thus : Anath *chipha*, vehall hada *chipha*. The Arabic translation has *alsachra* in both places.

² The Cephias in the first clause must be translated Πέτρος, *Petrus*, because it denotes a man ; and the masculine form, too, was already in use as the name of a person (comp. Leont. *Schol.* 18 ; Fabric. *biblioth. gr.* xi. 334). In the classics πέτρος signifies properly a stone, and πέτρα the whole rock. But this distinction is not always observed ; and in the passage before us it is entirely disregarded, as the Greek word must in both places correspond to the Aramaic, Cephias, which always means rock, and is used both as a proper and a common noun. The most we can say is, that πέτρα, in the second clause, more plainly includes Peter's confession also, as well as his person, and so far points us at once to the true interpretation. In figurative language, πέτρα denotes, in the classics, as in this passage, firmness, stability ; as in Homer, *Odyss.* XVII. 463 ; but very often, also, hardness of heart, want of feeling. The corresponding words in the modern languages admit of the same twofold application.

from the confession, and attached to the mere person of Peter as such.¹ For, in the first place, the name "Peter," v. 18, is antithetic to the original name, "Simon Bar-Jona," v. 17, and thus denotes the new, spiritual man, into which the old Simon either already was, or was gradually to be transformed by the Spirit of Christ. Then again, the Lord immediately afterwards (Matth. xvi. 23) says to the same apostle, when indulging his natural spirit: "Get thee behind me, *Satan*" (evil counsellor, adversary); "thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." His fault was, that he had undertaken, with the best intentions indeed, yet with the short-sightedness, fear of suffering, and presumption of the natural man, to dissuade his Master from submitting to the suffering of the cross, which was indispensable for the salvation of the world.

Equally unreasonable is it, on the other hand, to disjoin, as many Protestant theologians do, the "petra" from the preceding "Petros," and refer it solely to the confession in v. 16. For this plainly destroys the beautiful, vivacious play upon words and the significance of the *ταύτην*, which evidently refers to the nearest antecedent, "Petros." Besides, the church of Christ is built, not upon abstract doctrines and confessions, but upon living persons, as the bearers of the truth.²

Rather must we, with all the fathers, and the best modern Protestant interpreters, refer the words, "Thou art a rock," etc., by all means to Peter, indeed, but only to him as he appears in the immediate context; that is, to the renewed Peter, to whom God had revealed the mystery of the Incarnation (v. 16, 17); to Peter, the fearless confessor of the Saviour's divinity; in a word, to *Peter in Christ*. Thus the sense is: "I appoint thee, as the living witness of this fundamental truth, which thou hast just confessed, to be the chief instrument in the founding of my

¹ Then we should rather have in the Greek: ἐπὶ σοί τῷ πέτρῳ.

² Hardly worth mentioning is the reference of the "petra" to Christ. Christ is, indeed, the rock of the church, and the immovable Rock of Ages, in the highest sense of the term. But in this passage he evidently appears as the *architect* of the building, and cannot, without violating all rules of sound taste, present himself in one breath under two different images. Besides, this interpretation would make the preceding, "Thou art a rock," utterly unmeaning, and destroy the natural significance of the demonstrative particle "this."

indestructible church; and endow thee with all the powers of its government, under me, the builder and supreme ruler of the same." In these words, therefore, our Lord describes the *official character* of this apostle, and foretells to him his *future place in the history of the church*. Peter, with his faith and the bold profession of it, here appears as the foundation, and Christ himself as the master builder, of that wonderful spiritual edifice which no hostile power can destroy. Absolutely, Christ, of course, is called the foundation (*θεμέλιον*) of the church, besides which no other can be laid (1 Cor. iii. 11); but in a secondary or relative sense, so are the apostles also, whom Christ uses as His instruments. Hence in Eph. ii. 20, it is said of the saints, that they "are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (*ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν*), Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" and hence the twelve foundations (*θεμέλιοι*) of the New Jerusalem bear the names of the twelve apostles, of the Lamb (Rev. xxi. 14). If now the apostles, in general, under the guidance, of course, of the Holy Ghost, are the human founders of the church, as ministers of Christ, and "labourers together with God" (1 Cor. iii. 9), the proper Builder;—this is true in an altogether peculiar sense of Peter, their representative and leader.

The Acts of the Apostles, accordingly, testify to this;—the first twelve chapters forming a continuous commentary on the prophecy of Christ (Matth. xvi. 18). If, even before the resurrection, Peter stands at the head of the apostolic college,¹ he is plainly, after that event until the appearance of Paul, the leading spirit, the organ of the whole Christian body in word and deed. He is chief actor in the election of Matthias as successor of Judas; in the scenes of Pentecost; in the healing of the lame man; in the punishment of Ananias. It was he, more than any other, who extended the church by word and work in Judea and Samaria, and fearlessly defended the cause of Christ before the council, in the face of imprisonment and chains. And, while thus standing at the head of the Jewish mission, he also

¹ As appears from the lists of the apostles, in all of which Peter is mentioned first: and from many other passages: Matth. x. 2, *et seq.*; xiv. 28; xvi. 16-19; xvii. 4, 24, 25; xviii. 21; xix. 27. Mark iii. 16, *et seq.*; viii. 29; xi. 21. Luke vi. 14, *et seq.*; xii. 41; xxii. 31, *et seq.* John vi. 68; xxi. 15, *et seq.*, etc.

laid the foundation for the Gentile mission, by baptizing the uncircumcised Cornelius. In short, down to the apostolic council at Jerusalem, A.D. 50 (Acts xv.), Peter is unquestionably the most important personage in the church. He maintains a superiority so clearly assigned him by his natural capacities, as well as by the prophecy of Christ, and so fully confirmed by the facts of the apostolic history, that nothing but blind party spirit can explain, without, however, by any means justifying, the denial of it.

But it is to be observed, in the first place, that, in the history of Peter, we find no trace of any thing like spiritual tyranny or hierarchical presumption in this superiority. On the contrary, that apostle describes himself, with the greatest modesty, as “also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ,” and exhorts the elders to “feed the flock of God,” not in the spirit of covetousness and ambition, as lords over God’s heritage, but by a holy example (1 Pet. v. 1–3). Then again, this primacy never interfered with the independence of the other apostles in their own spheres of labour; nor did it keep pace with the spread of the church, nor extend itself, at least with equal force, to all parts of the same. After the apostolic council we see no longer Peter, but James, at the head of the church at Jerusalem and of the strict Jewish Christian party. On the field of the missionary operations among the Gentiles, and in the first literature of Christianity, Peter was quite eclipsed by the later called Paul (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 10). The same book of Acts, which gives Peter so prominent a position in the first part of its history, but loses sight of him altogether after ch. xv., places Paul in a relation to Peter, like that, so to speak, of the rising sun to the setting moon. At all events, the relation was one of perfect independence, as is at once conclusively proved by the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians. For Paul does not derive his authority in any way whatever from Peter, but directly from Jesus Christ, and was so far from considering Peter his superior, that he boldly resisted him to the face at Antioch and charged him openly with inconsistency. In the last stadium of its development, after the death of Peter and Paul, John alone was fitted to lead the apostolic church, and by his genius to complete its organization. But who can for a moment entertain the idea,

which necessarily flows from the Roman doctrine of the *perpetual jure divino* force of Peter's primacy over the church *universal*, that the beloved disciple, who leaned on the bosom of the God-man, was subject to the bishop of Rome, a Linus or a Clement, as the successor of Peter and heir to his authority; or even that Peter himself exercised a papal authority over John? The peculiar office assigned to Peter, therefore, refers plainly to the work of *laying the foundation* of the apostolic church; and it can be regarded as transmissible and of universal force, only in the sense in which the gifts of all the other apostles may be said to perpetuate themselves in the Christian world, and in which the apostles themselves may be viewed as determining, by their personal acts, as well as the continued influence of their word and spirit, every step in the history of the church.

§ 91. *Later Labours of Peter. His First Epistle.*

As we have already given an ample share of attention to Peter's labours down to his collision with Paul at Antioch,¹ it only remains to speak of his subsequent activity, which, however, is involved in mysterious darkness. We here have to leave the authentic accounts of Holy Scripture, and enter upon the uncertain ground of tradition. The Acts, after the apostolic council (ch. xv.), make no further mention of this apostle, and seem thus to intimate, that he again left Jerusalem in the year 50, or soon after, and resigned this field of labour to James, who thenceforth appears at the head of the mother church (comp. Acts xxi. 18, *et seq.*) It is altogether consistent with his position of mediation between James, the strict apostle of the Jews, and Paul, the liberal apostle of the Gentiles, that he should extend the sphere of his activity beyond Palestine, and even preach the gospel to the Gentiles; though he continued to be, on the whole, the most distinguished leader of the Jewish Christian portion of the church. Even after the council at Jerusalem, Paul calls him pre-eminently the Apostle of the *circumcision* (Gal. ii. 8); and from the epistles to the Corinthians it appears, that the Jewish Christians appealed with special predilection to Cephas.

Soon after the year 50, we find him at Antioch in company

¹ Comp. § 56, 57, 59, 60, 69, and 70.

with Paul and Barnabas (Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*); but how long he stayed there, we are not told.¹ From an incidental remark in the first epistle to the Corinthians, which was written in the year 57, it would appear that Peter never settled permanently in any place, but, as the very idea of an apostle implies, made missionary journeys, in which, too, he took his wife with him;² though of these journeys the New Testament gives us no further account. According to Origen and Eusebius,³ he preached to the Jews scattered in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. There is no sufficient reason for pronouncing this old tradition a false inference from the superscription of his first epistle. The epistle certainly contains no distinct intimation that the author had previously visited those countries; but we must consider, that it is a circular letter, and therefore, general in its contents, like the epistle to the Ephesians. Furthermore, the second epistle of Peter, addressed to the same churches as the first (2 Peter iii. 1), presupposes a personal acquaintance with the readers (i. 16). On the other hand, many modern scholars, taking the literal interpretation of Babylon (1 Peter v. 13), have based on it the opinion, that Peter at one time laboured in the Parthian empire; while the ancients rather understood Rome to be here meant. The only certain memorials of his later activity are his two epistles in our canon. With these we must now acquaint ourselves more minutely, before proceeding to discuss the point of his reputed residence in Rome.

A. *The First Epistle of Peter.*

1. The *readers* of this epistle are to be sought, according to the salutation (i. 1), in Asia Minor, in the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Proconsular Asia, and Bithynia—countries in which Christianity was planted mainly by Paul and his dis-

¹ The tradition of Eusebius and Jerome makes Peter the founder and first bishop of the church at Antioch; but this is irreconcilable with the account in Acts xi. 19, *et seq.* Far sooner might this be said of Barnabas and Paul, who had previously laboured there. The work of founding, however, is not always necessarily limited to first beginnings; and that Peter had an essential agency in the organization and strengthening of the church at Antioch, is in itself very probable, even though he might have resided there but a short time.

² 1 Cor. ix. 5. Comp. Matth. viii. 14. Luke iv. 38; where Peter's mother-in-law is mentioned.

³ Euseb. *H. Eccl.* III. 1 and 3; also Epiphanius, *Haeres* XXVII. p. 107, and Jerome, *Script. eccl. sub Petro*. Origen himself says, Eus. III. 1, *πεπενησμένους . . . ἑοικέν*, and certainly seems here to express his view as a mere *supposition*, founded on 1 Pet. i. 1.

ciples. The address—"Elect strangers (pilgrims) of the *dispersion*" (ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς Ἰόντου, etc.), might seem to confine the epistle to the *Jewish* Christians, who were scattered through those provinces. But the contents of the letter itself¹ are specially addressed to *Gentile* Christians; and, in fact, we know, from the Acts and Paul's epistles, that the churches in Asia Minor were a mixture of both Jews and Gentiles. The terms applied to the readers are, therefore, to be taken as figurative—Peter conceiving all believers as pilgrims to a heavenly home, an incorruptible inheritance,² and transferring the notion of the Diaspora to the Christians, as the true spiritual Israel, dispersed in the unbelieving world (ii. 9. Comp. John xi. 52).

2. *Scope and contents.* The object of this hortatory circular seems to have been twofold: first, by awakening lively hope, and pointing to the example of Christ, to exhort the readers to a life corresponding to their faith, especially to patience and steadfastness under existing or impending persecutions (ii. 11; v. 11); and, secondly, at the same time to establish and confirm them in the doctrine and the grace which had been communicated to them from the first (v. 12; comp. 2 Pet. iii. 15); and therefore, as Paul and his followers had founded those churches, to testify Peter's essential agreement in faith with the Apostle of the Gentiles. The occasion may have been given by Judaizing teachers, who, as we see, especially from the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, took all pains to undermine the influence of Paul, and for this purpose made a false use particularly of the name and authority of Peter, as the oldest and most distinguished Apostle of the Jews. Hence Peter assures those churches, that those who first preached the gospel to them were filled with the Holy Ghost (i. 12), and that the doctrine delivered to them was the eternal, unchangeable word of the Lord (i. 25). Hence, too, the letter was sent by Silvanus (v. 12), who, having been a disciple and companion of Paul, and his co-labourer in the planting of those churches, was eminently qualified for such a mission. In fact, the letter itself, in its doctrinal contents, and even its forms of expression, bears a very close affinity to the epistles of Paul, particularly those to the Ephesians and Colossians, which

¹ 1 Peter i. 14, 18; ii. 9, 10; iii. 6; iv. 3.

² 1 Peter i. 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 17; ii. 11. Comp. Heb. xi. 13, 14, 16.

are addressed to people in the same regions, are aimed, directly or indirectly, against similar errors, and thus show the essential unanimity of the two apostles in the fundamental doctrines of salvation.¹ Perhaps the coincidences of Peter's epistle with these, which were written at least two years before, as well as with that of James, are intentional, to make surer of the object in view.² Moreover, the letter is characterized by a certain fire altogether suiting Peter's temperament, but purified by experience, a blooming freshness, and a meekness and mildness strongly contrasting with the haughty arrogance of so many of the bishops of Rome—chap. v. being directly aimed against an overbearing, hierarchical spirit. It is full of joyful hope and precious consolation, especially for the suffering—a true fulfilment of the Saviour's injunction, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren" (Luke xxii. 32).

3. As to the *date* of its composition, we have at once a hint in the fact of its being sent by Silvanus (v. 12). This person is undoubtedly the same as the Silvanus mentioned in 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19; and by the abbreviated form, Silas, in Acts xv. 22–40; xvi. 19; xvii. 10, 14, 15; xviii. 5. He sprang from the church of Jerusalem, and had long been acquainted with Peter, but appears as a companion of Paul until

¹ Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5; iv. 3, *et seq.*

² This affinity is, with Schwegler (*Das nachapost. Zeitalter*, II. p. 2, *et seq.*) the main argument against the genuineness of the first epistle of Peter. In spite of all external evidence, he makes this letter a production of the Pauline school in the time of the persecution under Trajan. But such a hypothesis can commend itself only to those who draw their knowledge of Peter's way of thinking from the pseudo-Clementine writings and other apocryphal and heretical productions of the second century, instead of taking it from the hitherto generally acknowledged and only reliable source, viz., the Acts of the Apostles, which, especially in ch. xv., place beyond doubt the essential fellowship of Peter and Paul in doctrine, that *κοινωνία*, of which Paul also speaks in Gal. ii. 9. Then again, it must be considered, that Peter's gifts lay not in the line of developing doctrines and of authorship, but in the practical sphere of the planting, training, and governing of the church. Besides, the epistles of Peter, after all, have also many peculiarities in perfect keeping with what we otherwise know of that apostle's character. To the subjective taste of the sceptical De Wette, who looks in vain for a "literary peculiarity" in it, we may boldly oppose the opinions of equally profound scholars, who judge quite otherwise. Erasmus calls the first epistle "*epistolam profecto dignam apostolorum principe, plenam auctoritatis et majestatis apostolicæ, verbis parcam, sententiis dissertam.*" Grotius says, "*Habet hæc ep. τὸ σφοδρὸν, conveniens ingenio principis apostolorum;*" and Bengel, "*Mirabilis est gravitas et alacritas Petri sermonis, lectorem suavissime retinens.*" Comp. Steiger's *Commentary*, p. 5, *et seq.*

the latter made his fourth journey to Jerusalem, A.D. 54 (Acts xviii. 18–22). It was not till after this, therefore, that he could have come into Peter's neighbourhood. We are pointed to a still later date by the probable relation of the first epistle of Peter to the epistles which Paul wrote during his imprisonment at Rome, especially that to the Ephesians (written A.D. 62);¹ and (if the "Babylon" at the close mean, according to the oldest interpretation, Rome), by Paul's not mentioning Peter in those epistles, even in the second to Timothy (A.D. 63). This justifies the inference, that Peter was not then in Rome, and consequently could not then have written a letter from there. With this agrees the fact, that Mark was in Peter's vicinity at the time this epistle was written; for he had probably complied with Paul's invitation to come to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11). Hence the year 63 would be the earliest, and the year 67, beyond which Peter certainly cannot have lived, the latest date for the composition of his first epistle. The most probable time is the year 64, shortly before the outbreak of the persecution under Nero. Hug, Neander, and others think, indeed, that such passages as ii. 12; iii. 13, *et seq.*; iv. 4, already presuppose the existence of this persecution,—the Christians having been previously persecuted, not as Christians, as they now were (iv. 14, 16, where this term occurs as a nickname, of which the believers were not to be ashamed), nor even as "evil-doers" (*κακοποιοί*, malefici, iii. 16), but simply as a Jewish sect. They were first persecuted as Christians by order of Nero. But we cannot regard this evidence as at all conclusive. For, in the first place, the name "Christians," which was first brought into vogue undoubtedly by the heathens, existed long before (Acts xi. 26); and the passage of Tacitus, which is appealed to, implies that the Christians, as such, were, even before the year 64, objects of the most bitter suspicion and hatred,² otherwise even Nero could not well have accused them of setting the city on fire. Then again, isolated, temporary persecutions arose in various places after the

¹ Comp. 1 Pet. i. 1, *et seq.* with Eph. i. 4–7; i. 3 with i. 3; ii. 18 with vi. 5; iii. 1 with v. 22; v. 5 with v. 21. See the tables of comparison in the Introductions of Hug, Credner, and De Wette.

² Ann XV. 44: "Quos per *flagitia invisos*, vulgus *Christianos* appellabat." Comp. the epithet "malefica," which Suetonius, *Ner.* 16, applies to the "superstitio" of the Christians.

death of Stephen ;¹ and that the Neronian persecution extended to the provinces of Asia Minor, is at least not told us by the pagan historians, though it is certainly, in itself, very probable, that the example of the chief city operated unfavourably to the Christians in the whole empire.² The expression, “evil-doers,” 1 Peter iii. 16, has a parallel in 2 Tim. ii. 9, where Paul says of himself, that he is bound as a *κακοῦργος*. Furthermore, the term does not necessarily mean “state criminals,” so as to presuppose already an imperial prohibition of Christianity as a “religio illicita” (such a decree, by the way, was never issued by Nero, but first by Trajan) ; but is rather shown by the context to be the simple antithesis of “well-doing,” “a good conversation in Christ.”³ Finally, the hypothesis, that Peter wrote in the midst of the Neronian persecution, which broke out in July, A.D. 64, cannot well be reconciled with the genuineness of the second epistle, which was composed afterwards, and with the familiar tradition of his being crucified in this persecution. If he were in Rome, he would hardly have sat down to write under such circumstances, or at least he would have painted the sufferings of the Christians in much stronger colours, and would not have failed to speak of the danger to his own life. But if, as Hug and Neander suppose, he wrote from Babylon in Asia, it must have been a long time, by reason of the great distance and little communication between the Roman and the Parthian empires, before he heard of that persecution ; and it is not very probable that he then went immediately to Rome, as we should have to assume, to die as a martyr there in the same persecution. Thus much, however, is certain from the epistle itself, that the Christians, at the time of its composition, were already in a depressed condition throughout the Roman empire, and had to expect the worst ; and this points to the later years of Nero’s reign. The heavy storm of persecution, raised by this tyrant,

¹ Comp. Acts xii. 1, *et seq.* 1 Cor. iv. 9, *et seq.* ; xv. 31, *et seq.* Acts xix. 23, *et seq.* 2 Cor. xi. 23, *et seq.* 1 Thess. i. 6, 7 ; ii. 14-16. 2 Thess. i. 5. Phil. i. 28-30. Heb. x. 32, *et seq.*

² It is first mentioned by Orosius, who, however, being a contemporary of Augustine (†430), cannot be taken as authority on this point. He says, *Histor* VII. 7 : “Nam primus Romæ Christianos suppliciis et mortibus adfecit (Nero) ac *per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciarī imperavit*,” etc.

³ 1 Pet. iii. 12, 17 ; iv. 15 ; ii. 19, 20.

was approaching, and, from what Tacitus says of the very bitter hatred on the part of the heathens towards the new sect, might be regarded as nigh at hand. Perhaps, also, this fact contains the reason of the allegorical designation of Rome as Babylon (v. 13).

4. Respecting the *place* where this epistle was written, we have no other hint than the mention of Babylon at the close (v. 13). But this is differently interpreted, and is closely connected with the question of Peter's residence in Rome, of which we shall speak at large in a following section.

§ 92. *The Second Epistle of Peter.*

B. *The Second Epistle* is addressed to the same churches as the first (2 Peter iii. 1), but was written somewhat later, shortly before the death of the apostle, the approach of which the Lord had revealed to him (i. 14). It contains an exhortation to grow in grace and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and to prepare for the last advent of the Lord; a renewed assurance of the unity of faith between the author and the Apostle of the Gentiles, the first teacher and principal founder of those churches; but above all, an earnest warning against dangerous errorists, of whom some are viewed as already present, others as still to come, and who strongly resemble those attacked by Paul in the Pastoral Epistles. While, thus, the first letter of Peter arms the Christians chiefly against outward danger from the heathen persecution, which was to proceed to Rome, the seat of the centralized despotism of the world; the second letter has mainly in view the dangers from within, from pseudo-christian and anti-christian errorists; and in this respect it may be compared with Moses' farewell song, and Paul's parting address to the elders of Ephesus. It is an earnest prophecy of future conflicts, the germs of which were already beginning to unfold themselves.

But while the first epistle of Peter is attested as genuine, even by external evidence of the strongest kind,¹ and was universally regarded in the ancient church as apostolical and canonical; the second epistle, on the contrary, does not distinctly appear under its proper name until it is mentioned by Origen in the third

¹ Even the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians contains seven quotations from it.

century,¹ and is enumerated by Eusebius among the *antilegomena*, as to the genuineness of which the church was then as yet divided. Besides this, there are internal marks fitted to awaken suspicion of its genuineness; first of all the mention of the writings of the “beloved brother Paul,” in which many things are hard to be understood, and are wrested by false teachers (xiii. 15, 16). But, strange as this allusion may at first sight appear, it is found, on closer examination, to be well grounded and deeply significant, as aimed against the old and new Gnostics and free-thinkers, who made Paul’s doctrine of liberty a cloak for licentiousness and wickedness in theory and in practice. Then again, in the delineation of the heretics in the second chapter and first part of the third, the author has been thought to draw on the epistle of Jude in a manner unworthy of the prince of the apostles; while some advocates of the genuineness of the epistle, as most recently, Guericke, see in this an intentional coincidence, suited to Peter’s purpose. But, on nearer inspection, the dependence appears rather on the part of Jude; the false teachers in 2 Peter being described for the most part prophetically, as yet to come, but in Jude as already present. In Jude 17, 18, for instance, there is palpable reference to the apostolic warning in 2 Peter iii. 3.² The very fulfilment of Peter’s prophecy in the congregations with which Jude came in contact, seems to have been the chief occasion of Jude’s epistle. The other sections of the epistle in view, the first and third chapters, are confessedly full of spirit and fire, and every way worthy of an apostle.³ Moreover, Peter, in chap. i. 14, 16, *et seq.*; iii. 1, 15, so unequivocally presents himself as the author, that the epistle, at least in substance, in its essential thoughts, can only have come either from him or from a manifest impostor. But that the divine providence, which so carefully watched the composi-

¹ He says in Euseb. *H. E.* VI. 25: “Peter, on whom the church of Christ is built, . . . has left only one generally acknowledged epistle; perhaps also a second; for this is disputed (ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γὰρ).” The old Syriac version, the Peshito, does not contain the second epistle of Peter.

² Comp. Heydenreich’s *Vertheidigung der Aechtheit des zw. Briefs Petri*, p. 97, *et seq.*, and Thiersch’s *Versuch zur Herstellung des histor. Standpunkts für die Kritik der N. Tlichen Schriften* (1845), p. 239 and 275.

³ Hence some critics have taken a middle course, against which, however, strong objections may be raised. Bertholdt, for instance, holds the first and third chapters to be genuine; and Ullmann only the first.

tion and collection of the apostolic writings, has allowed the production of a forger to creep in amongst the sacred records of Christianity, may be believed by those with whom what they call science and criticism stands above faith. We freely confess that we cannot admit it without reasons which absolutely compel us. We, therefore, hold the epistle in question to be an apostolical production which rightly has its place in the canon, and contains exhortations most serious and important even for our day. The vacillation of tradition respecting it might perhaps be accounted for by the fact that it was not designed for immediate general circulation, but was, as it were, a testament of Peter, not to be opened till after his death (comp. 2 Peter i. 14, 15), as, in fact, its contents relate more to the future than to the present, and for this reason were first received into the later collections of the canon.

§ 93. *Peter in Rome.*

It is the universal testimony of tradition, that Peter laboured last in Rome, and there suffered martyrdom under Nero. This testimony, indeed, was soon loaded with all sorts of unhistorical and in some cases self-contradictory additions; has been abused by the Roman hierarchy in support of its extravagant claims; and is, therefore, sometimes, either from polemic zeal against the papacy,¹ or from historical scepticism,² called in question. But by the great majority of Protestant historians the main fact has always been admitted.³ We shall first hear the most important

¹ Especially by the Dutch Theologian, Frederic Spanheim, who, in his famous *Dissertatio de ficta projectione Petri Apostoli in urbem Romam, deque non una traditionis origine*, 1679, first subjected the matter to a thorough investigation, and sought to establish by a critical examination of witnesses the doubt, which had already been raised respecting Peter's residence in Rome by the Waldenses, and such declared enemies of the Papacy as Marsilius of Padua, Michael of Cæsena, Matthias Flacius, and Claudius Salmasius. He attributed the story mainly to the ambition of the Roman Church.

² By the modern hypercritics, Baur (in several articles in the "Tübinger theol. Zeitschrift," and in his *Paulus*, p. 212, *et seq.*) and Schwegler (*Nachapost. Zeitalter*, I. p. 301, *et seq.*) They derive the tradition from the supposed jealousy of the Jewish Christians in Rome towards Paul's Gentile Christians; from the effort to set the Jewish apostle, Peter, above Paul. So also De Wette, *Einl. in's N. T.* p. 314.

³ By almost all the older Reformed theologians, who devoted any special diligence and talent to the study of church antiquity, such as Scaliger, Casaubonus, Petit, Usher, Pearson, Cave; and then by Schröckh, Mynster, Berthold, Gieseler, Neander (who, however, in the last edition of his *Apost. Gesch.* seems to have been staggered by

evidence of tradition on this point ; next, attempt to determine the probable duration of Peter's residence in Rome ; and lastly, examine the accounts of the mode of his death.

1. *The testimony of tradition respecting Peter's residence in Rome.*

(a) The earliest information is given us by Peter himself in the mention of his residence at the close of his first epistle, as most anciently interpreted, ch. v. 13 : "The (church, that is) at *Babylon*, elected together with (you), saluteth you ; and (so doth) Marcus my son." The meaning of *Babylon* is, indeed, disputed. Neander, Steiger, De Wette, Wieseler, and others (also the distinguished Roman Catholic theologian, Hug), understand by it the famous *Babylon* or *Babel* on the *Euphrates*. Upon this vast city the prediction of the Hebrew prophets¹ had, indeed, been terribly fulfilled, and, in the time of the apostles, as *Strabo*, *Pausanias*, and *Pliny*, unanimously assure us, it presented nothing but a scene of ruins (*οὐδὲν εἰ μὴ τεῖχος*), a desolation (*solitudo*).² It may certainly be supposed, however, that some portion of it still remained habitable ; and, since there were many thousands of Jews in the satrapy of *Babylonia*,³ it is not in itself improbable, that Peter laid the field of his labour in those regions. But in this case it might reasonably be expected, that some traces of his activity there should be preserved. Tradition, however, knows nothing at all of any residence of Peter in the *Parthian* empire, though it tells of a sojourn of the apostle *Thomas* there.⁴ Then again, this interpretation makes it hard to account for the acquaintance, which the epistle confessedly evinces, with the later epistles of *Paul* ; as there was but little communication between *Babylonia* and the *Roman* empire. Equally unaccountable would be Peter's meeting with *Mark*

Baur's arguments, and declares himself, not so decidedly as before, in favour of the tradition), *Credner*, *Bleek*, *Olshausen*, and *Wieseler* (in the second *Excursus* of his *Chronologie*), and a host of others not to be mentioned, who have not entered into any minute investigation of the matter.

¹ *Isaiah* xiii. 19, *et seq.* ; xiv. 4, 12 ; xlv. 1, *et seq.*

² See the passages in *Meyerhoff*, *Einleit. in die petrin. Schriften* (1835), p. 129.

³ *Josephus*, *Antiqu.* XV. 3, 1. *Philo*, *De legat. ad Caj.* p. 587. It is true, *Josephus* tells us also, XVIII. 9, 8, that under the emperor *Caligula* many Jews migrated from *Babylon* to *Seleucia* for fear of persecution, and that, five years afterwards, a pestilence drove away the rest. But they might very well have returned before the epistle of Peter was written, as *Caligula* died in the year 41.

⁴ *Origen*, in *Ensebius*, *Hist. Eccl.* III. 1.

(v. 13); for he was in Rome in the years 61–63 (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 23), and soon after would seem to have been in Asia, whence he was recalled by Paul to Rome, not long before that apostle's martyrdom (2 Tim. iv. 11). If, as we have good reason to suppose, he obeyed this call, he could not so soon have reached the banks of the Euphrates. But the case is perfectly simple, if Peter himself, about that time or soon after, came to Rome, and there wrote his epistle.

These difficulties compel us to return to the earliest and, in antiquity, the only current interpretation of Babylon, which makes it *Rome*. This is well known to be its sense in the Apocalypse,¹ as also Roman Catholic expositors admit. It has been objected, indeed, that this symbolical designation of the metropolis of Heathendom, however suitable in a poetical book of prophecy, like the Apocalypse, would be very strange in the simple prose of an epistle. But this objection is far more than met by the following positive arguments in favour of the figurative interpretation, viz.: (1) the unanimous testimony of the ancient church,² and (2) the analogy of other terms in the salutation, which would likewise have to be regarded as out of place. Neander, indeed, would take "the co-elect" to be the wife, and the "son Marcus," and actual son of Peter.³ But, although Peter, as we learn from 1 Cor. ix. 5, took his wife with him on his missionary tours, yet his mentioning her in an official circular, especially to churches, with which, in Neander's (erroneous) view, he was not personally acquainted, were most certainly unbecoming and unexampled in Christian antiquity. It is impossible, also, to see how *συνεκλεκτῇ* should of itself express the idea of a

¹ Rev. xiv. 8; xvi. 19; xvii. 5; xviii. 2, 10, 21. Comp. the allusions, xvii. 9, to the seven hills, and, xvii. 18, to the universal dominion of Rome. So in a fragment of the Sibylline Books (V. 143, 159), supposed to belong to the first century, Rome is styled Babylon.

² So Papias or Clement of Alexandria, in *Euseb.* II. 15; the subscription of the epistle; Jerome in his *Catal. s. Petr.*; Oecumenius, etc. We know not of a single voice from antiquity in favour of referring this passage to Babylon in Asia. For referring it to Rome, though in some cases from different premises, are Grotius, Lardner, Cave, Semler, Hitzig (*Ueber Johannes Marcus*, etc., p. 186), Baur, Schwegler, Thiersch (*Versuch zur Herstellung*, etc., p. 110, and *Die Kirche im apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 208).

³ *Apostelgesch.* II. p. 590. Note 4. So Mill, Bengel, Meyerhoff, l. c. p. 126, *et seq.* Steiger, De Wette, and Wieseler, on the contrary, though they make the place Babylon proper, yet refer *συνεκλεκτῇ* to the church (of Assyrian Babylon), and *Μάρκος* to the evangelist.

wife, or why, in this case, the phrase ἐν Βαβυλῶνι is placed in this particular grammatical relation. These difficulties all vanish, if we supply ἐκκλησία, making it the Christian congregation, as is done in the Peshito and the Vulgate. As to Marcus; tradition knows nothing of a proper son of Peter by that name.¹ On the contrary, it is altogether natural to understand here the evangelist, the well known missionary assistant of Paul and Peter, a native of Jerusalem, and probably converted by Peter (Acts xii. 12, *et seq.*), but at the same time, like the bearer of the letter, Silvanus, a connecting link between him and the Apostle of the Gentiles. If, therefore, in agreement with all the older commentators, we must take the υἱός, according to the familiar usage of the New Testament,² as a trope, and refer συνεκλεκτή to the church, these are arguments in favour of the symbolical interpretation of Babylon. Nay, in this very juxtaposition of the two names we find a significant contrast, especially under the depressed circumstances of the Christians, which the epistle presupposes. The apostle styles the churches, to which he writes, “elect pilgrims” (ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς Πόντου, etc., i. 1); and so also the church, from the midst of which he writes, an “elect” of God to eternal life in the seat of the deepest heathen corruption, such as must have made an author, especially so conformed as Peter to the thought and style of the prophets, involuntarily recur to the Old Testament representations of Babylon. Add to this, that the epistle was written in the later years of Nero, when cruelty and tyranny had full sway, and shortly before the bloody scenes of the Neronian persecution; therefore at a time, when the Christians, as the letter itself and the above quoted passage of Tacitus prove, had already become objects of the foulest suspicion and the most shameful calumny. In view of all this it must be admitted, that the symbolical designation of Rome, which Sylvanus could more particularly explain to the readers, in case they did not at once understand it, was in perfect keeping with the whole contents and the historical circumstances

¹ Clement of Alexandria speaks, indeed, in general terms, of children of Peter (*Strom.* III. f. 448, Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο), and tradition mentions a daughter, Petronilla (comp. *Acta Sanct.* 30th May). But nowhere is a Mark named among his children.

² Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 16-18. Gal. iv. 19. 1 Tim. i. 2, 18. 2 Tim. i. 2; ii. 1.

of the epistle. The proper name of Rome in this connection would evidently have been far less significant. This city soon after became, in fact, the centre of persecution, and the same to the Christians, that the old Babylon had been to the Israelites.

(b) We go now to the church fathers. The Roman bishop, Clement, a disciple of Paul, tells us, indeed, that Peter, after suffering many trials, died a martyr; but states neither the manner nor the place of his death—probably because he might presume they were well known.¹ For wherever the place of Peter's martyrdom is named, it is always Rome; and no other church claimed this distinction, though it was a great point with churches at that time to have had celebrated martyrs. To say nothing of the testimony of Papias in a somewhat obscure passage in Eusebius (II. 15), referring Babylon (1 Peter v. 13) to Rome, the letter of his contemporary, Ignatius, to the Romans takes for granted that Peter had preached to them;² as does also a fragment from the *praedicatio Petri*, which belongs to the beginning of the second century.³ More distinct is the deposition of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (about 170), who, in his epistle to the Romans, calls the *Roman* and Corinthian churches the joint planting of *Peter* and Paul, and adds: "For both taught alike in our Corinth, when they planted us, and both alike also in Italy in the same place (ὁμόσε, by which, in accordance with what precedes, we can only understand Rome), after having taught there, at the same time suffered martyrdom."⁴ This making Peter one of the *founders* of the Corinthian church

¹ In his first epistle to the Corinthians, which belongs to the last half of the first century, ch. 5, Πέτρος διὰ ζῆλον ἁδικῶν οὐχ ἓνα, οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπέμεινεν (according to others, ὑπήνεγκεν) πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Then follows the more full and distinct testimony above quoted respecting Paul's end. The μαρτυρήσας is here probably to be taken in its primary sense of witnessing by word, as in the passage immediately following, and not, as it is commonly taken, as denoting martyrdom. The latter, however, is to be inferred from the whole context, particularly from the clause immediately preceding, which Clement goes on to illustrate by examples, διὰ ζῆλον καὶ φθόνον οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιοτάτοι στύλοι ἐδιώχθησαν, καὶ ἕως θανάτου ἦλθον.

² Ch. iv. Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν.

³ In *Cypriani opera*, ed. Rigaltius, p. 139, "Liber, qui inscribitur Pauli praedicatio (which was probably the last part of the *praedicatio Petri*, comp. Credner's *Beiträge zur Einl.* I. 360), in quo libro invenies, post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem, postremo in urbe, quasi tunc primum, invicem sibi esse cognitos."

⁴ In Eusebius, *H. E.* l. II. c. 25.

is certainly, at all events, very inaccurate, and might possibly have arisen merely from a misunderstanding of what Paul says (1 Cor. i. 12) of the party of Cephas—the existence of which, however, in the Corinthian church does not necessarily imply any personal or direct influence of Peter upon it. We have no right, however, for this error to reject the whole account; and it is in fact very possible that Peter, either before or after the arrest of Paul, perhaps on his way to Rome, also visited Corinth; and thus, though he could not be said, in the strict sense of the term, to have founded that church, which was already of long standing, yet he might have strengthened it and confirmed it in the faith, just as Paul confirmed the church of Rome, and was hence called one of its founders. Irenæus, who was connected through Polycarp with the apostle John, says of Peter and Paul, that they preached the gospel and founded the church at Rome.¹ Somewhat later, about the year 200, the Roman presbyter Caius, in his work against the Montanist, Proclus of Asia Minor,² says: “I can, however, show the monuments (τρόπαια) of the apostles (Peter and Paul). For if thou wilt go to the Vatican or out on the Ostian way, thou wilt find the monuments of the men who founded this church.” At about the same time Clement of Alexandria affirms distinctly that Peter preached the gospel at Rome; and so does his distinguished disciple Origen.³ Tertullian congratulates the church at Rome, because *there Peter had been made conformable to the sufferings of the Lord* (*i.e.*, had been crucified), Paul had been crowned with the same death as the Baptist (*i.e.*, had been beheaded), and John, having been plunged into boiling oil without hurt (a fabulous addition, no doubt), had been banished to Patmos.⁴

These are the oldest and most important testimonies. They are drawn from the most different parts of the church, and cannot be reasonably accounted for except on the ground of some historical reality. True, the statements we meet with in the apocryphal writings and the later church fathers, as Eusebius

¹ *Adv. haer.* III. 1, comp. 3, where the Roman Church is called an “a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis, Petro et Paulo fundata et constituta ecclesia.”

² In Eusebius, *H. E.* II. 25.

³ In Euseb. *H. E.* II. 15; VI. 14; II. 25; III. 1.

⁴ *De praeser. haer.* c. 36.

and Jerome, and even Clement of Alexandria,¹ are laden with fabulous embellishments, particularly respecting Peter's meeting with Simon Magus at Rome—a story which rests probably on false inferences from the narrative in Acts viii. 18, *et seq.*, and on a mistake of Justin Martyr in supposing he had seen a statue of Simon Magus in that city. But such accretions, gathered by an old tradition, by no means warrant us to discard its primary substance. This certainly cannot be accounted for here by the rivalry between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile converts of Paul in Rome.² For it would then have been early and decidedly contradicted by the latter; whereas the oldest witnesses for it are mostly from this very school of Paul and John. As little can it be attributed to the hierarchical ambition of the Roman bishops; though this, it is true, soon laid hold of the story, and used it for its own ends. The tradition itself, it may easily be shown, is older than the use or abuse of it for hierarchical purposes; and had there been sufficient ground, it would certainly have been called in question in the first centuries by the opponents of the pretensions of Rome in the Greek and African churches. But no such contradiction was raised in any quarter, either by Catholics or by heretics and schismatics. On the contrary, Cyprian of Africa and Firmilian of Cappadocia, in their controversy with Stephen, bishop of Rome, on the validity of heretical baptism, in the middle of the third century, always take for granted that the Roman bishop is the successor of Peter, and reproach him as acting inconsistently with this very position, and as leaving the foundation laid by Peter, whom he ought faithfully to represent.³ The gigantic structure of the papacy

¹ In Euseb. *H. E.* II. 15. It is not clear, however, whether Eusebius quotes the authority of Clement's *ὑποτυπώσεις* merely for what he says concerning the origin of the gospel of Mark (comp. vi. 14), or also concerning the meeting of Peter with Simon Magus in the beginning of this and in chapter xiv.

² As Baur, Schwegler, and De Wette vainly suppose.

³ Says the bishop Firmilian in his letter to Cyprian, "Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod, qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiæ collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat et ecclesiarum multarum nova ædificia constituat, dum esse illic baptismus sua auctoritate defendit." And immediately after, "Stephanus, qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se prædicat, nullo adversus hæreticos zelo excitatur" (as he ought to be, being the successor of Peter). See Cypr. *Epist.* 75, cap. 17. (al. 15). This controversy, which is mistaken and used for the opposite purpose by many Protestant church historians, Dr Neander

could never have arisen without any historical foundation, out of a *pure lie*. Rather has this very fact of the presence and martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome, in connection with the political position of this metropolis of the world, been the indispensable condition of its growth and its long influence over Christendom.

2. *The length of Peter's residence in Rome.*

The questions, when Peter came to Rome, how long and in what capacity he laboured there, the oldest accounts leave undecided. When Dionysius of Corinth, Irenæus, and Caius ascribe to Peter and Paul the joint founding of the Roman church, they are not necessarily to be understood as referring to time, and meaning that these apostles had brought the first tidings of the gospel to that city. For, in this sense, even Paul was not its founder, any more than Peter was the founder of the Corinthian church, as this same Dionysius nevertheless affirms. In fact, however, that expression, which in itself may denote simply Peter's important agency in moulding a church of long standing, but still imperfectly instructed and organized,¹ soon came to be taken exclusively in the chronological sense, and thus gave rise to a confusion in the tradition favoured by the silence of the New Testament in regard to the later labours of Peter. Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, is the first to make our apostle come to Rome under Claudius, A.D. 42, preside over the church there twenty years (according to the Armenian text, of which the Greek original is now lost), or twenty-five (according to Jerome's translation), and suffer martyrdom in the last year of Nero, A.D. 67 or 68. Jerome also, on the authority of Eusebius, informs us that Peter was first (for seven years, according to a later view) bishop of Antioch, and then for twenty-five years from the second

among the rest, has been presented in its true light by Dr Rothe (*Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung*, I. p. 676), "Firmilian does not here deny Stephen's claims to the succession on the *cathedra Petri*, but recognises and uses them to place the conduct of Stephen in a still more unfavourable light. He says, "Stephen, as successor of Peter, is called to be the peculiar organ for maintaining and promoting the unity of the church; it is the harder to conceive how he can have adopted a course which goes directly to obscure, nay, to destroy this unity."

¹ So Barnabas and Paul may be styled with perfect correctness the proper founders of the church of Antioch, though Christians from Jerusalem and Hellenists from Cyprus and Cyrene had already preceded them thither with the seed of the gospel (Acts xi. 19-25). So, as an example in later time, Calvin passes for the founder of the Genevan church, though the Reformation was introduced there several years before him by Farel.

year of Claudius, or A.D. 42, bishop of Rome;¹ and this statement is followed by the older Roman Catholic historians.²

But this view contradicts the plainest facts of the New Testament, and cannot stand a moment before the bar of criticism. The Acts of the Apostles, which so fully describe the earlier labours of Peter, in no case allow the supposition of his departure from Palestine before his arrest by Agrippa, Acts xii. 3-17; and as this falls in the year of the famine in Palestine (comp. Acts xi. 28; xii. 1), or A.D. 44 (not 42, as Eusebius wrongly assumes), it at any rate sets aside the seven years' bishopric in Antioch, and cuts off several years from the twenty-five assigned to the episcopate in Rome. After his escape from prison in the fourth year of Claudius, the apostle might possibly, indeed, have travelled to Rome; as Luke remarks indefinitely (Acts xii. 17) that he departed "to another place" (εἰς ἕτερον τόπον), and thenceforth loses sight of him till the apostolic council in the year 50 (ch. 15).³ This is, in itself, by no means improbable, as the

¹ *De Script. Eccles.* c. I. "Simon Petrus—post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiæ et prædicationem dispersionis eorum, qui de circumcisione crediderant in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et Bithynia, secundo Claudii imperatoris anno ad expugnandum Simonem magum Romam pergit ibique *viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit*, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est decimum quartum."

² Yet even the most zealous friends of the papacy are forced at least to modify the Eusebian tradition. Baronius in his *Annals* (ad ann. 39, No. 25), makes Peter, indeed, for seven years bishop of Antioch, and then for twenty-five years bishop of Rome; but at the same time assumes, that the apostle was often absent, as when, for instance, the facts of the New Testament imperatively demand it; and this he refers to his papal dignity, to his divine commission to oversee the whole church. "Sic videas," says he, "Petrum his temporibus numquam fere eodem loco consistere, sed ut opus esse videret, peragraræ provincias, invisere ecclesias ac denique omnes quæ sunt universalis præfecturæ functiones, pastoralis sollicitudine exequi ac consumere." But the official duties of the Pope do not require him *now* to travel all over the world. Why should it have been the case only at the time of Peter, and not at any subsequent period?

³ This period is accordingly fixed upon by the acute and learned defender of the Roman tradition, Fr. Windischmann, in his *Vindiciæ Petrinæ*, Ratisb. 1836, p. 112-116, for the first journey of Peter to Rome. Rather too hastily the Protestant divine, Thiersch, agrees with him in this, saying in his work on the *N. T. Can.*, p. 104, *et seq.*: "It is certain that, before the banishment of the Jews from the city by Claudius, a Christian church, and that mainly, if not wholly, of Jewish converts, had been founded there. And we see not what objection of any force can be urged against the tradition that Peter was its founder. It may well have been established between the years 44 and 50, or 51; that is, between Peter's flight from Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17) and the apostolic council (ch. xv.); so that it may have been this very banishment of the Jews from Rome which forced Peter also to leave that city, and led him to return to Jerusalem, where we find him at the meeting of the council." The same view Thiersch defends in his later work on the *Apostolic Church*, p. 96, *et seq.*

attention of the apostle must have been directed at an early day to the centre of the Roman empire, where the Jews were very numerous. It would also most easily explain that ancient and universal tradition which calls Peter the *founder* of the Roman Church. But on the other hand, this possibility becomes at once, to say the least, highly improbable, when we consider that the epistle to the Romans, written A.D. 58, contains not the slightest hint of Peter's having previously been in Rome. Nay, the very writing of it seems to imply the contrary. For Paul repeatedly declares it to have been his principle not to build on another's foundation, nor to encroach on the sphere of another apostle's labours (Rom. xv. 20, 21; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16). To uphold the tradition, therefore, we must assume two churches at Rome; one founded by Peter under Claudius, consisting exclusively of Jewish Christians, and dissolved by the aforesaid edict of the emperor; another entirely new one, gathered after the year 52 from the Gentiles, and mainly through the influence of Paul and his disciples. But this resort also becomes precarious when we consider how easily the whole story of Peter's going to Rome under the emperor Claudius may be explained from mistakes and false inferences. Thus, Justin Martyr had reported¹ that, *under Claudius*, Simon Magus went to Rome, and there won many followers and even divine honours, as was shown by a statue erected to him on an island in the Tiber. This statue was in fact found in the year 1574 in the place described; but it turned out to be a statue, not of *Simo Sanctus*, but of the Sabine-Roman divinity, *Semo Sancus* or *Sangus*,² of whom the Oriental Justin had probably never heard.³ But tradition at once laid hold of this statement, and, in its zeal to glorify Peter as much as possible, sent him on the heels of the supposed Samaritan arch-heretic to Rome, to vanquish the sorcerer there as triumphantly as he had before done in Samaria (Acts viii).⁴ To this was added the report of Suetonius con-

¹ *Apol. maj.*, ch. 26 and 56.

² Comp. Ovid's *Fast.* VI. 213.

³ See Baronius: *Annal.* ad. ann. 44; Otto's *Notes on Just. Apol. maj.*, ch. 26 (*Opp. Just.* I. p. 66-68); also Hug's *Einl.* II. 69, *et seq.*; Gieseler's *Kirch. Gesch.* I. 1, p. 64; Neander's *Kirch. Gesch.* II., p. 783 (2d ed.)

⁴ This conflict is noticed already in the Pseudoclementine writings, particularly the *Recognitions*, written in the first quarter of the third century. That Eusebius was

cerning the edict of Claudius, which expelled the Jews and probably also the Jewish Christians (on account of the “impulsore *Chresto*,” comp. § 80) from Rome, and thus presupposes the existence of a Christian church there; and since Peter was regarded as the proper founder of it, it followed of course that he had already gone to Rome in this emperor’s reign. The more readily the early date assigned by Eusebius and Jerome to Peter’s presence in this city may be accounted for in this way, as having arisen from erroneous combinations, the less claim can it have to our credence.

It is far more difficult, however, to show, that Peter was in Rome all the time, or even for any considerable period, from the reign of Claudius onward. The Acts of the Apostles and Paul’s epistles on to the year 63 or 64, that is, to the salutation in Peter’s first epistle (v. 13), give no hint of his presence in this city, but incontrovertible proof of his absence from it. For in the year 50 he was in Jerusalem at the apostolic council (Acts xv.) He had thus far laboured mainly, not among the Gentiles, of whom the majority of the Roman church consisted,¹ but among the Jews; and expected to do so still for the immediate future, according to his agreement then made with Paul and Barnabas (Gal. ii. 7, 9). Soon after this we find him at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*) At the writing of the first epistle to the Corinthians, A.D. 57, he was yet without a fixed abode, travelling about as a missionary with his wife (1 Cor. ix. 5). In 58 he cannot have been in Rome, or Paul would certainly have sent a salutation to him amongst the many others (Rom. xvi.) The whole epistle to the Romans knows nothing of Peter’s labouring, either then or before, in the great metropolis, but rather, as already remarked, supposes the contrary. In the spring of 61 Paul came himself as a prisoner to Rome. The Acts inform us of his meeting with the Christians of that place (xxviii. 15, *et seq.*), but say not a syllable of Peter; which, were he there, would be utterly inexplicable. In the years 61-63 Paul wrote from Rome his last epistles, in which he introduces by name his companions and helpers, presents salutations from

guided in his chronology by the above statement of Justin, to which he himself appeals, is plain from his *Hist. Eccl.* II., 13-15.

¹ Rom. i. 5-7, 13; xi. 13, 25, 28; xiv. 1, *et seq.*; xv. 15, 16.

them, and complains at last of being left alone,¹ but is perfectly silent about Peter; and this surely not from jealousy or enmity, but because that apostle was not in the neighbourhood.

Peter, therefore, must have come to Rome after the second epistle to Timothy was written, and not long before writing his own epistles, that is, in the last half of the year 63 or in the beginning of 64.² And as he suffered martyrdom in the Neronian persecution, we can hardly extend his sojourn there beyond a year.³ Eusebius, indeed, and Jerome place his death in the year 67. But as they also affirm, with universal tradition, that he died at the same time with Paul in the Neronian persecution, which, according to Tacitus, broke out in July 64; and as a second persecution under the same emperor cannot be proved; the date here given is clearly wrong, and the error is no doubt owing in part to the fact, that on this point the fathers, instead of following the full and reliable statement of Tacitus, made use of Suetonius, who separates the persecution from the conflagration which occasioned it, and in general is not chronological in his narrative.⁴

That Peter, as long as he was in Rome, was associated with Paul at the head of the church, and exercised a leading influence, needs no proof. But he was not the first *bishop* of Rome in the

¹ Col. iv. 10, 11. Philem. 23, 24. Phil. iv. 21, 22. 2 Tim. iv. 9-22; i. 15-18.

² This is confirmed in substance by Lactantius (†330), who makes Peter come to Rome first during Nero's reign (*De mortibus persec.* c. 2: "Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit," etc.); and by Origen (†254), who brings him there at the close of his life (ἐπὶ τέλει, in Euseb. *H. E.* III. 1).

³ As even an unprejudiced Roman Catholic writer, Herbst, grants in an article in the *Theol. quarterly* of Drey, Herbst, and Hirscher. Tübingen, 1820. No. 4, p. 567, *et seq.* Other scholars of the Roman church also, as Valesius, Pagi, Baluz, Hug, Klee, limit the residence of Peter in Rome to the later years of Nero's reign, or speak of his being there before as at least not demonstrable. Windischmann (l. c.), on the contrary, would make Peter, indeed, reside in Rome also during the intervals of which we have no distinct notice in the New Testament as regards the point in question; viz., during the years 44-49, 52-58, 60-61, and 64-68. But in this case the apostle must have been there very furtively; he must have purposely kept out of the way of the epistle to the Romans and of Paul's arrival there; and, according to Paul's epistles, left no trace of his residence there before A.D. 63! In zeal for the honour of the prince of the apostles, we must exclaim to such an advocate: Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!

⁴ On this defect in the chronology of Eusebius, comp. Wieseler, l. c., p. 544, *et seq.* The influence of Suetonius is very clear on Orosius, *Histor.* VII. 7. Only Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* II. 29, seems to have used the statement of Tacitus. Perhaps the condemnatory judgment, which the Stoical historian pronounces on the Christians (*Annal.* XV. 44), was the cause of his being neglected by the church fathers.

later sense of the term, for the apostolic office was not confined to a particular diocese, but implies a commission to the whole world ; nor was he *pope* in the Roman sense, for this contradicts the independent dignity of Paul, as we learn it from all his epistles as well as from the Acts of the Apostles. This erroneous view meets us first in the Ebionistic Clementine Homilies, from which, as afterwards wrought into the more orthodox Recognitions, it passed into the Catholic church. Clement himself, the third bishop of Rome, knows nothing of it, and from his glowing description of Paul in the fifth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, it is pretty evident that he ascribes greater importance for the Roman church to this apostle than to Peter, of whom he has much less to say. Irenæus and Eusebius rather name Linus (other fathers, Clement) as *first* bishop of Rome ; and even Epiphanius plainly makes a distinction between the apostolic and the episcopal offices.¹

§ 94. *Martyrdom of Peter. (Note on the Claims of the Papacy.)*

It is the voice of all antiquity that Peter was crucified in the persecution under Nero. His death, therefore, as already remarked, cannot be placed in the year 67, as it is even by most of the later historians on the authority of Eusebius and Jerome. It must have occurred in the year 64, in which, according to the reliable testimony of Tacitus, that persecution broke out, immediately after the conflagration in July, and in which also, though perhaps somewhat earlier, and by the less ignominious process of decapitation, the earthly labours of Paul were brought to an end. The place of his death, according to the above quoted testimony of Caius, was pointed out at the end of the second century as the Vatican hill beyond the Tiber, where lay the Circus and Nero's Gardens, and where, according to Tacitus, the persecution of the Christians actually took place. There also was built to his memory the church of St Peter ; as over Paul's grave on the Ostian way outside the city was erected the church of St Paul. It is very easy to see that the successful activity of these great apostles in Rome must have drawn the attention of the heathen, and excited their hatred against the

¹ See Schliemann's *Clementinen* (1844), p. 115 ; and Gieseler's *Kirch. Gesch.* I. 1, pp. 103, 281, and 362, note 9.

new sect. And the danger to the state religion, from the numerous conversions, the more readily explains the horrible cruelties of the Neronian persecution.¹

The first testimony of the crucifixion of Peter we find in the appendix to the Gospel of John, chap. xxi. 18, 19, where our Lord himself in that memorable dialogue foretells to him that, when he should be old, he should stretch forth his hands and another should gird him, and carry him whither he (naturally) would not. Tertullian expressly remarks that Peter was made *like* the Lord in his passion.² The statement that he was crucified with his head downwards, first appears in Origen;³ and this was afterwards taken as evidence of his peculiar humility in counting himself unworthy to die in the same way as the Saviour. When we read in Tacitus of the unnatural tortures inflicted on the Christians by Nero, the fact of such a mode of death is not improbable, though the motive here brought in to explain it betrays a somewhat morbid conception of the nature of humility, belonging to a later time. The apostles rather held it their highest honour and joy to be like their Lord and Master in every particular. It is related, first by Ambrose, we believe, that Peter, shortly before his death, overpowered by his former love of life, made his escape from prison, but was arrested and confounded in his flight, by the appearance of the Saviour bearing his cross. To the recreant's question, "Lord, whither art thou going?" the Lord replied, "I am going to Rome to be crucified

¹ Lactantius also gives prominence to this connection of things in his work, *De mortibus persec.* ch. 2: "Quumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit et, editis quibusdam miraculis, quae virtute ipsius Dei data sibi ab eo potestate faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, Deoque templum fidele ac stabile collocavit. Qua re ad Neronem delata, quum animadverteret, non modo Romae, sed ubique quotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum, et ad religionem novam damnata vetustate transire, ut erat execrabilis ac nocens tyrannus, prosilivit ad excidendum coeleste templum delendamque justitiam, et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci affixit et Paulum (gladio) interfecit."

² *De praescr. haeret.*, c. 36: "Romam. . . . ubi Petrus passioni Dominicae adaequatur."

³ In Euseb.: *H. E.* III. 1: Πέτρος ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεσχολεπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιῶσας παθεῖν. This is then thus paraphrased, in the spirit of monkish piety, by *Rufinus*—"Crucifixus est deorsum capite demerso, quod ipse ita fieri deprecatus est, *ne exaequari Domino videretur*." So Jerome, who had a special relish for such traits, *De vir illustr.* ch. 1: "A quo (Nerone) et affixus cruci, martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis; asserens se indignum, qui sic crucifigeretur, ut Dominus suus."

again!" Peter hastily returned and met his death with joy. This tradition still lives in the mouth of the people of Rome, and is embodied in a church edifice called *Domino quo vadis*, beyond the Sebastian gate on the Appian way. It is one of those significant stories which rest not, indeed, on any historical fact, yet on a right apprehension of the character in question, and to which we may apply the Italian proverb, *Se non é vero, é ben trovato*. To shrink from suffering was, it is true, a characteristic of the natural Simon.¹ But at so great an age he had no doubt long ago overcome it, and welcomed the hour when he was counted worthy to seal his love to the Saviour with his blood, and permitted to put off his earthly tabernacle (2 Peter i. 14), and enter upon the "inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away" (1 Peter i. 4), which he knew to be reserved for him in heaven.

NOTE.—The vast importance of the subject calls upon us, before taking leave of Peter, to add a few remarks on *the claims of the papacy*, which are well known to centre here. These claims, however, by no means rest entirely on the memorable words of Matth. xvi. 18, which are now admitted by the best Protestant commentators to refer to Peter, and upon the actual superiority of this apostle, as it appears clear as the sun in the gospels and the first part of the Acts. They are built also upon two other assumptions, which cannot be proved, at least directly, from the New Testament, and must, therefore, maintain themselves on historical and dogmatic ground.

1. The first assumption is, that this primacy of Peter is *transferable*. This is based by Roman Catholic theologians partly on the general ground of the nature and wants of the church, which is supposed to require a visible as well as an invisible head, and an infallible tribunal of authority to decide on questions of faith and the contradictory expositions of the Bible; partly on the special promise of her indestructibleness immediately added by the Lord to his words respecting Peter, Matth. xvi. 18; whereas the older Protestant controversialists commonly regard the pre-eminence in question as simply affecting Peter *personally*, as in the case of the surnames given to other apostles, and referring to corresponding personal gifts and relations,—“sons of thunder,” for example, applied to the sons of Zebedee (Mark iii. 17); “Zelotes,” to Simon (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13); “traitor,” to Judas Iscariot (Luke vi. 16).

2. The second assumption is, that Peter *did actually transfer* his primacy; and that, not to the bishop of Jerusalem, nor of Antioch, where he resided at any rate a considerable time, but to the bishop of *Rome*. The truth of this

¹ Comp. Matth. xvi. 22, 23; his denial of his Lord; and the Saviour's language to him, John xxi. 18.

turns primarily on historical inquiry respecting Peter's residence and martyrdom in Rome. These two points we have conceded in this section and the preceding, with almost all the leading Protestant historians, as strongly attested and well grounded facts; admitting, that without such historical foundation the eighteen hundred years' history of the papacy would be to us absolutely unaccountable. This concession, however, is not enough to establish a continued primacy of the Roman See, much less an actual supremacy of jurisdiction. For Paul was likewise in Rome and suffered martyrdom there; nor are we any where informed, that he was at all subject to the authority of Peter. Besides, there is no document whatever to be found respecting any actual transfer of the primacy to Linus or Clement; and it is not even certain which of these two was the first bishop of Rome, as the statements of the church fathers differ here.

For the point in hand, therefore, no proper historical or diplomatic evidence can be brought, and the only resort is the general philosophical argument, that the successor in office is in the nature of the case by regular ordination heir to the prerogatives of his predecessor. This is undoubtedly perfectly true with the limitation: so far as these prerogatives are inseparable from the office itself. Thus we are thrown back upon the first proposition, and all turns at last on the question, whether the Lord in that prophetic passage instituted a permanent or only a temporary primacy for the superintendence of the Christian church.

The ultra-Protestant view decidedly repudiates the idea of the permanent primacy, and denies the papacy the least Scriptural ground or divine right. It accordingly denounces this system as the most colossal and barefaced lie known to history, and applies to it in fact the predictions of the New Testament concerning Antichrist and the "Man of Sin," who "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped." To this extreme view, however, we cannot at all agree. It not only turns all history before the Reformation into an inextricable labyrinth, but gives the lie to the Lord's precious promise to be and rule in His church continually—for it is an absolute impossibility to make out an unbroken perpetuity of Christianity without the Catholic church—nay, plays mightily in its results, without willing or knowing it, into the hands of scepticism and infidelity. No! In the face of a history of eighteen hundred years, during which the papacy has really evinced something of a rock-like character; in the face of the clear testimonies of almost all the important church fathers, both Greek and Latin, in favour of a peculiar pre-eminence of the Roman See as the continuation of the cathedra Petri in some form; in view of the consistency and tenacity with which the Catholic church has at all times held fast all the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the Trinity, the true divinity and humanity of Christ, the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible (all of which antichristianity denies); in view of the great merits of the popes in maintaining orthodoxy, asserting the unity, freedom, and independence of the church against the assaults of the secular power, upholding the sanctity of marriage, and especially spreading Christianity and civilization among all

the Romanic, Germanic, and Scandinavian nations;—in view of all these facts, which are coming more and more to be conceded by unprejudiced Protestant historians, we cannot possibly question, that the Roman Catholic church, however corrupt in many doctrines and practices, belongs to the historical development of Christianity itself, and that it must accordingly have also some ground even in the Holy Scriptures. Nay, we believe, that even since the Reformation the pope as such, that is, in his official character, is not Antichrist, but the legitimate head of the *Roman* church, which, however, is certainly not, as she herself arrogantly asserts, identical with *the Catholic or universal* church, but simply, like Greek and Protestant Christendom, a part of it.

But, on the other hand, in opposition to the exclusive Romish or papistical view of history, we must contend :

1. There is a difference between a primacy of honour and influence (*primus inter pares*), and a supremacy of jurisdiction. The first, which presupposes equal rights in the other apostles, to whom the same authority and commission was given as to Peter, directly by Christ (Matth. xviii. 18 ; John xx. 23), was undoubtedly conceded to the bishop of Rome by the ancient church, both of the East and of the West, also by the ecumenical councils of Nice (325), Constantinople (381), and Chalcedon (451) ; the latter was early claimed by the popes, but resisted in several instances, by Irenæus, Firmilianus, Cyprianus, by the whole Greek church, and was fully established only in the Middle Ages.

2. But there are other differences equally important as to the nature of this primacy and the mode of its exercise. From the purely spiritual superiority of Peter, a fisherman of Galilee, who, even when an apostle, had no silver nor gold (Acts iii. 6), who travelled from land to land preaching the gospel without the least ostentation, accompanied by his wife (1 Cor. ix. 5), who humbly called himself a “co-presbyter,” and emphatically warned his brethren against all tyranny over conscience and love of filthy lucre (1 Peter v. 1-3), it is a vast stride to the temporal as well as spiritual dominion which the later medieval popes exercised over all the churches and states of western Christendom, distributing crowns and kingdoms, deposing princes, absolving the subjects from the oath of allegiance, persecuting all dissenters, good and bad, ruling the conscience with the iron rod of despotism, and even frequently perverting their unlimited power to their own selfish ends.

3. If Peter himself, after having received the glorious promise, Matth. xvi., thought *humanly* and not *divinely* ; if he in carnal zeal cut off Malchus’ ear ; nay, thrice denied his Lord and Master from fear of men ; and even after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, committed at Antioch a palpable inconsistency ; much less can we expect of his successors, who are not endowed, as he was, with the same supernatural gifts, that they should have always lived and acted consistently with their high calling, any more than the kings and high-priests of the Jewish theocracy. Just in proportion, however, as the popes have abused their power, followed their own thoughts and plans instead of the word of God, and degraded the pastoral office by a wicked life, as in

the disgraceful tenth century, again at the time of the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, and at the end of the fifteenth century and beginning of the sixteenth (for an example we have but to remember that moral monster, Alexander VI.), in that degree is an earnest protest not only allowed, but even authorized and demanded. It is sanctioned by the example of the Old Testament prophets, who came out in condemnation of the ungodly priests and kings of Israel; by the example of Christ, who called Peter, for his horror of suffering, an offence and an adversary (Matth. xvi. 23; John xviii. 11), rebuked his carnal zeal with the exclamation: "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matth. xxvi. 52), warned him of his presumptuousness and self-confidence (Mark xiv. 30, 37), and deeply humbled him for his denial, though he afterwards restored him (John xxi. 15-18); and finally by the example of Paul, who sharply reproved his senior colleague, nay, even in presence of the congregation of Antioch charged him with hypocrisy (Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*) If the church of Rome has inherited the prerogatives and gifts of Peter, she has also frequently, and on a larger scale, repeated his weaknesses and unfaithfulness.

4. Finally, we must take account of what has already been remarked at the close of § 90, that the independence of Paul on the field of the Gentile missions in the second stadium of the apostolic period is, according to the distinct testimony of Luke in Acts, and of Paul in his epistles, a fact as incontrovertible as the primacy of Peter in the province of the Jewish mission and through the whole first stadium of this period down to the council at Jerusalem; and further, that the first century shows no trace of any dependence of John or the church of Asia Minor on Rome and its bishops. If, therefore, the primacy of Peter perpetuates itself in any sense in the history of the church, we may as reasonably expect, that the independent position of the other two leading apostles also, so far as it is compatible with the essential unity of the church, has a typical significancy for after times; and if the Roman church has chosen to found itself on Peter, and has thus far withstood every storm, we claim Paul, the free apostle of the Gentiles, as the forerunner and representative of evangelical Protestantism; while in John, the beloved disciple, who lay on Jesus' bosom, enjoyed the profoundest view of the central mystery of the incarnation, and outlived all the other apostles, the disciple who "tarries till the Lord comes" (John xxi. 22), we see the type and the pledge of the ideal church of the future, the higher unity of the Jewish Christianity of Peter in the Catholic church, and the Gentile Christianity of Paul in the Protestant.

We have thus suggested a middle course between the two extreme Roman and Protestant views of history. In this way alone, we are convinced, can all church history, whether before or after the Reformation, be properly understood and duly appreciated as a continuous proof of the uninterrupted presence and manifold working of Christ in the church, against which even the gates of hell shall never prevail.

§ 9 . *James the Just—Church of Jerusalem.*

Next to Peter, JAMES held the most prominent position among the Jewish Christians, and from the time of the apostolic council, A.D. 50, or in fact from the flight of Peter, A.D. 44 (Acts xii. 17), he appears as the head of the church of Jerusalem. This cannot have been the *elder* James, the brother of John and one of the three favourite disciples of Jesus; for he had already been beheaded in the year 44, at the order of Herod Agrippa (Acts xii. 2). We must, therefore, understand here either, as Jerome is first to do, the *younger* apostle of this name, son of Alpheus and Mary (Mark xvi. 1), who, according to the usual interpretation of John xix. 25, was a cousin of Jesus,¹ and might in this case be called also, after the Hebrew usage, the “brother of Jesus;” or a *third* James, a literal brother of the Lord according to the flesh.² The latter view, again, admits of two hypotheses. These so-called “brothers of Jesus,” our James among the rest, may have been either younger sons of Joseph and Mary (comp. Matth. i. 25), as several Protestant scholars suppose, or sons of Joseph by a previous marriage, and thus only half-brothers of the Lord, as most of the Greek fathers on the authority of old traditions maintain. In the last two cases this James would have been, not indeed one of the twelve disciples, but still a man of apostolic standing like Barnabas.³ In the

¹ Comp. Matth. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1.

² Comp. Matth. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; Matth. xii. 46, *et seq.*; Mark iii. 31, *et seq.*; Luke viii. 19, *et seq.*; John ii. 12; vii. 5; Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5.

³ On this very complicated question, as well as on the whole subject of this section, I refer, to save space, to my work, *Das Verhältniss des Jakobus, Bruders des Herrn, zu Jakobus Alphäi, auf's Neue exegetisch und historisch untersucht*. Berlin, 1842; where the exegetical and patristic testimonies for and against the identity of these two persons are collected and tested at length. Subsequent examination, however, has led me to find two faults with this treatise: (1.) Rather too little is made (p. 29) of the dogmatical argument against supposing Mary to have had other children; viz., the assumption of the perpetual virginity of the bride of the Holy Ghost, the mother of the Saviour of the world. This primitive church view, which by no means necessarily conflicts with the *πρωτότοκος*, Matth. i. 25, must have had a true religious feeling at the bottom of it, or it would not have been so generally prevalent so early even as the second and third century. It was still held fast also by the Reformers: comp. *Artic. Smalcald.*, Pars. I., Art. IV. (p. 303, ed. Hase: “*Ex Maria pura, sancta, semper virgine*”); *Form. Concord.*, p. 767 (“*Unde et vere θεοτόκος Dei genetrix est, et tamen virgo mansit*”); and Zwingli’s Commentary on Matth. i. 18 and 25; comp. also Olshausen on Matth. i. 25. (2.) That the view which makes the brothers of Jesus sons of Joseph by a *former* marriage, therefore only half-brothers of the Lord, receives too little stress. For this view seems to be the oldest,

second part of the Acts, he is styled simply James without any epithet, ch. xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18. So several times by Paul, Gal. ii. 9, 12, *et seq.* 1 Cor. xv. 7. On the contrary, Paul once names James along with Peter, adding, "the brother of the Lord," Gal. i. 19.¹ The same surname is applied to the president of the church at Jerusalem by the old ecclesiastical writers. Besides this, he is also called by them "James the Just," and "bishop of Jerusalem."²

According to Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian historian, probably a native of Palestine, who wrote about the middle of the second century, this James led from his youth a life of strict, Nazarite asceticism, and represented the ideal of a Jewish saint. "In common with the apostles," says this writer,³ "James, the brother of the Lord, who, from the days of the Lord, down to our own time, has been universally called *the Just*, undertook the direction of the community. For there were many who were called James. But this one was holy from his mother's womb. No razor came upon his head, he anointed himself not with oil, and took no bath. He alone—(among the Christians)—was allowed to enter the sanctuary (the holy of holies).⁴ For he also wore no woollen, but linen garments.⁵ But he went also into the

and is found not only in apocryphal writings, and the Apostolical Constitutions, but in the most distinguished Greek and Latin church fathers, as Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyrill of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Hilary, and Ambrose. See the passages in the work above quoted, p. 80, *et seq.* Eusebins also should probably be enumerated here, as he calls James, *H. E.* II. 1, a "son of Joseph," but nowhere a son of Mary. For the identity of this James with the younger apostle of the same name, on the contrary, there is no older authority than Jerome.

¹ With this must be compared the passages just cited from the Gospels, which mention a James among the "brothers of the Lord."

² By Hegesippus, Clemens Alex., the Apostolical Constitutions, Eusebius, etc. See the passages given in full in Rothe, *Die Anfänge der Christl. Kirche und ihrer Verfassung*, vol. i. p. 264, *et seq.*

³ In Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* II. 23. Comp. my tract above mentioned, p. 61, *et seq.*

⁴ Εἰς τὰ ἅγια, which sometimes stands for τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, Num. iv. 19; 1 Kings viii. 6; 2 Chron. iv. 22; v. 7. Epiphanius, *Haer.* XXIX. 4, and LXXVIII. 13, *et seq.*, relates of James, that once a year he could enter the most holy place like the high-priest διὰ τὸ Ναζωραῖον αὐτὸν εἶναι, and that he wore the diadem of the high-priest (τὸ πέταλον = כִּתְיָוָה, the golden plate on the forehead with the inscription, "Holiness to the Lord.") Tradition, however, ascribes the latter also to St John, as Polycrates says in Euseb. *H. E.* V. 24: Ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορηκώς. But perhaps this is merely a symbolical description of John's oversight of the church of Asia Minor; for, literally understood, this act would surely be altogether unhistorical, and far more incomprehensible than in James.

⁵ The clothing of the priests when engaged in the temple service. Out of the

temple, and he was so often found there upon his knees, praying for the forgiveness of the people, that his knees became callous like a camel's, because he always knelt down when he prayed to God and implored forgiveness for the people. On account of his extraordinary righteousness he was called the Just, and Oblias (which should doubtless more properly be read Obliam, from בְּרִיָּה and מִצָּד),—*i.e.*, being interpreted, the bulwark of the people and righteousness ($\delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \text{ 'Ελληνιστὶ περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη}$)."

We have no sufficient reason at all for questioning the substance of this description, and pronouncing it a legendary exaggeration, after the style of the heretical Ebionism; as is done by those, to whose own taste the Jewish elements in the ancient church are so offensive. On the contrary, from all we otherwise know of James, thus much at any rate is incontrovertible, that he was by far the most conservative of all the more prominent apostles, and the least removed from legal Judaism. His piety lived altogether in the hallowed forms of the old covenant, and in all probability to the day of his death he kept not only the Sabbath, but the whole ceremonial law. Hence he was the head and supreme authority of the stricter party among the Jewish Christians; while Peter, after the conversion of Cornelius, held middle ground between him and Paul. In Gal. ii. 9, according to the true reading, Paul names him at the head of the Jewish apostles, who were distinguished as "pillars." In the apostolic council it was James, who spoke the decisive word, when, in common with Peter and Paul, and against the pharisaically disposed and heretical Jewish Christians, who made circumcision necessary to salvation, he sided with the Gentile Christians, and declared them to be even without circumcision citizens of the Messiah's kingdom, and yet at the same time laid upon them certain restrictions, and as for the rest wished to have nothing changed in the piety of the Jewish Christians. His disciples (οἱ τοῦ 'Ιακώβου), who induced even Peter and Barnabas at Antioch to withdraw for a while from intercourse with the uncircumcised brethren (Gal. ii. 12, 13), no doubt, indeed, pushed his principles too far (comp. Acts xv. 13, *et seq.*; Gal. ii. 9), as the Pauline party in Corinth went beyond Paul, and the Petrine

temple they wore common woollen garments (Lev. xvi. 4; Ezra xliv. 17). Hegesippus evidently seeks to depict James as the perfect ideal of a Jewish priest.

beyond Peter. But still their conduct shows, that the strict Judaizers, the antagonists of Paul, would fain appeal to the authority of James, and even place him above Peter.¹ At the last visit of the apostle of the Gentiles to Jerusalem James rejoiced with his elders in the great success of that apostle's preaching among the heathen, and praised the Lord for it. But for the sake of the Jewish Christian zealots, who regarded Paul with suspicion, he advised him to accommodate himself to their ascetic piety, and to engage in the exercises connected with the Nazarite vow (Acts xxi. 20, *et seq.*) In short, James stood as mediator between Jews and Christians, in almost equal esteem with both, and for this reason eminently fitted to maintain peace between the two economies so far as the principles of Christianity at all allowed. It is in perfect keeping with his character and calling, that we find him not itinerating like the other apostles, but more like the later bishops, continuing till his death in Jerusalem, the centre of the theocracy.

Had not the influence of James been modified and completed by that of a Peter and especially a Paul, Christianity would perhaps never have cast off entirely the envelope of Judaism and risen to independence. Yet the influence of James, too, was altogether necessary. He, if any, could gain the ancient chosen nation in a body. God placed such a representative of the purest form of Old Testament piety in the midst of the Jews, to make their transition to the faith of the Messiah as easy as possible, even at the eleventh hour. But when they refused to hear this last messenger of peace, the divine forbearance was exhausted, and the fearful, long threatened judgment broke upon them. And with this the mission of James was fulfilled. He was not to outlive the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. Shortly before it, according to Hegesippus, in the year 69, after having borne powerful testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus, and pointed to his second coming in the clouds of heaven, he was thrown down from the pinnacle of the temple and stoned by

¹ In the Pseudoclementine Homilies, and especially in the Epistles which precede them, this James figures as the supreme bishop of all Christendom, to whom even the apostle Peter and the Roman bishop are subject. The historical writings of the Ebionites in general are full of glorifications of James. According to Epiphanius, (*Haer.* XXX., *Ebion.* § 16), there were among them also ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου, descriptions of his pretended ascension to heaven.

the Pharisees. His last words were: "I beg of thee, Lord, God, Father, forgive them! for they know not what they do." He was buried by the temple, and his tombstone was still pointed out there in the time of Hegesippus. "He was"—as this writer concludes his account—"a true witness to Jews and Greeks, that Jesus is the Christ. Soon afterwards (*εὐθύς*) Vespasian besieged them."¹ Eusebius adds, that James stood so high and was so celebrated on all hands for his righteousness, that even the more intelligent of the Jews considered his martyrdom the cause of the siege of Jerusalem, which soon followed; and in agreement with this Josephus expressly says: "This fell upon the Jews in punishment for what they had done to James the Just, a brother of Jesus, who was called Christ. For him had the Jews slain, though he was the most upright of men."²

When after the destruction of Jerusalem the Jewish system of religion, as well as the Christian, was in a measure re-organized in Palestine, the surviving apostles and kinsmen of

¹ In Eusebius, *H. E.* II. 23.

² No such passage, however, in this form is to be found anywhere in Josephus, but simply the statement, *Archæol.* XX. 9, 1, that the violent high-priest Ananias, in the interval between the death of the Roman governor, Festus, and the arrival of Albinus, therefore in the year 62, accused "the brother of Jesus, called Christ, James by name, and some others," before the Sanhedrim as transgressors of the law (*ὡς παρανομησάντων*), and sentenced them to be stoned; with which procedure, however, the better part of the Jews themselves were dissatisfied. The words relative to James, *τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ καὶ*—and the *ἐτέρους* after *τινάς*, have been suspected by Clericus and Lardner, and latterly by Credner (*Einleitung in's N. T.*, I. p. 581), and Rothe (*Anfänge der chr. Kirche*, I. p. 275), as an interpolation (like the well known "testimonium de Christo" in the *Arch.* XVIII. 3, 3, on which comp. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I. 1, § 24, p. 81, *et seq.*); so that this passage would say nothing at all of a persecution of the Christians. But even admitting the words to be genuine, we still cannot give the statement of Josephus so unqualified a preference over that of Hegesippus, as Neander does, I. p. 580, *et seq.* For, in the first place, as to the discrepancy respecting the fact; Josephus, being a Jew, might have good reason to pass over in silence the cruel scenes which accompanied the execution of James, and, being a Pharisee, might feel inclined to put the blame of the murder on the Sadducee, Ananias. Then as to the chronology; the date given by Hegesippus is supported from other quarters. According to the *Epist. Clementis Rom. ad Jacobum*, c. 1 (*Patres Apost.* ed. Cotelier, tom. i. p. 611), and the *Clementina Epitome de gestis S. Petri*, c. 147 (*ib.* p. 798), and according to the whole Pseudoclementine literature, James survived the apostle Peter, who did not die before the year 64 at the earliest. So the *Chronicon paschale*, vol. i. p. 460 (ed. Bonnens.), places the martyrdom of James in the first year of Vespasian's reign. Eusebius varies. In his *H. E.* (II. 23; III. 11), following Hegesippus, he gives the year 69; while in his *Chronicon* (p. 205, ed. Scalig.), he puts the martyrdom of James in the year 63, no doubt on the authority of the above passage from Josephus.

the Lord, according to a tradition preserved by Eusebius, at a meeting in Jerusalem appointed Symeon, a cousin of Jesus (a son of Clopas, who according to Hegesippus was a brother of Joseph), successor to James. This Symeon presided over the church of Jerusalem as bishop till the time of the emperor Trajan, and at the age of a hundred and twenty years suffered martyrdom.¹ He had thirteen successors, all of Hebrew descent, who ruled, however, but a short time, and are known to us only by name.² Throughout this period the church of Jerusalem maintained its strictly Israelitish character, but united with it "the genuine knowledge of Christ,"³ and stood in communion with the Catholic church. Nay, even in the fourth century, in the sect of the Nazarenes (not to be confounded with the heretical Ebionites, who denied the divinity of Christ), we find the same combination of Judaism and Christianity as in James. The mass of the Jewish Christians, however, towards the close of Hadrian's reign, after the second destruction of Jerusalem, and the extinction of the line of the fifteen circumcised bishops, gradually merged in the Greek church.

§ 96. *The Epistle of James.*

From James the Just, we have preserved in the canon an epistle, which is, indeed, one of the doubted books (the *antilegomena* of Eusebius), but has strong external and still stronger internal evidence in its favour, and was perhaps written before or soon after the apostolic council.⁴ It was written no doubt from Jerusalem, the theocratic metropolis and James' permanent field of labour. Its readers were the "twelve tribes which are scattered abroad" (i. 1 ;) that is, the Jews, who lived in and out of Palestine, dispersed among the Gentiles; or rather Jewish Christians; for to these, as the true spiritual Israel, he applies

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* III. 11, 32.

² Justus, Zacchaeus, Tobias, Benjamin, John, Matthias, Philip, Seneca, Justus, Levi, Ephres, Joseph, and Juda; comp. Euseb. IV. 5.

³ Eus., l. c. Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, II. 31, says of these Jewish Christians, "They believed in Christ as God, while yet observing the law."

⁴ On this, see the modern investigations of Schneckenburger, Neander, Credner of Kern in his Commentary (where he has retracted his former doubts of its genuineness), and of Thiersch (*Die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter*, p. 106, *et seq.*) Comp. also my tract on James, above quoted, p. 83, *et seq.*

the Old Testament designation,¹ yet without drawing the line between the two economies, between the disciples of Moses and the disciples of Christ, so clearly as is done in the system of Paul, and as it was afterwards drawn in fact by the destruction of Jerusalem. The communities styled themselves yet, not churches, but synagogues (ii. 2), consisted mostly of poor people, and were oppressed and persecuted by the rich and powerful Jews.² Of Gentile Christians among them we have no trace. If there were any so early in Palestine and the surrounding regions, they had not yet become incorporated with the Jewish converts, and were not regarded by James as belonging to his charge.

The design of the letter is not doctrinal, but ethical and altogether practical. It aims to inculcate a living, active piety, and to combat a dead Jewish orthodoxy, an unproductive intellectual belief, which contents itself with theoretical knowledge and the mere reception of the Mosaic and Christian doctrine as true, instead of acting it out in the life (ii. 14, *et seq.*) Paul has a similar tendency in view in Rom. ii. 17–24 (comp. also John v. 39),³ while he elsewhere commonly contends against the opposite error of a righteousness of works without faith. Besides this there prevailed in the churches, to which the epistle is addressed, other evils, all more or less connected with a carnal Jewish way of thinking;—want of charity, censoriousness, pride and arrogance in the rich, quarrelsomeness, worldly-mindedness, etc. While James rebukes all these sins, and threatens them with the impending judgment, he comforts and cheers the poor, who are oppressed by the hard-hearted rich, and the brethren, who are persecuted by their unbelieving kinsmen.

This of itself indicates the contents of the letter, which perfectly correspond with all we otherwise know of the legal character and conservative position of its author. There is confessedly no other book in the New Testament, which leaves the peculiarly Christian element, the person and work of the Redeemer, so much in the background as this epistle. And so far does it

¹ Comp. Matth. xix. 28. Rom. ii. 28, *et seq.* Gal. vi. 16. 1 Pet. i. 1.

² James ii. 6, 7; v. 1, *et seq.* Comp. Heb. x. 34.

³ As late as the second century Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph., Jud.* p. 370, ed. Col.) speaks of Jews who imagined that, in consideration of their monotheism, God would not lay their sins to their charge.

differ from Paul's type of doctrine, that even a Luther in one-sided zeal for his doctrine of justification considered the two as irreconcilably opposed, and did not hesitate to call James' a "chaffy epistle;"¹ while others suppose, that James (ch. ii. 14, *et seq.*) intends to combat, not, indeed, Paul's doctrine of justification itself as rightly understood, yet at least the practical abuse of it (comp. 2 Peter iii. 16). But this is a wrong opinion. James has his eye, not upon Gnostic and Antinomian tendencies—for these developed themselves more amongst Gentile Christians—but upon the dead intellectual orthodoxy of Judaism, a self-righteous, stiffened Pharisaism; and he meets it with the same weapons used by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. The epistle of James, therefore, holds as important and necessary a place among the canonical epistles of the apostles, as that Sermon among the discourses of Christ. For, closely as it conforms, not only in thought but in its figurative, sententious style, to the prophetic and proverbial books of the Old Testament, yet the earnest, impressive moral admonitions, of which it consists—its exhortations to patience under suffering, to prayer, to humility, to true wisdom, to meekness, to peace, to the observance of the royal law of love, to a life corresponding to the confession of the mouth; its warnings against vain self-reliance, against sins of the tongue, against fickleness, envy, hatred, and uncharitableness in general,—all are thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of *Christian* morality, especially as presented in the Saviour's Sermon on the Mount. The name of Christ, indeed, appears only, as it were, in the distance, but is always men-

¹ In the preface to his edition of the New Testament of 1524, p. 105, "Therefore the epistle of St James is a real chaffy epistle compared with them (the writings of John, Paul, and Peter), for it has no evangelical cast at all." He expresses himself more fully in his remarkable preface to the epistles of St James and St Jude, 1522 (*Werke*, ed. Walch. XIV. p. 148, *et seq.*), at the close of which he thus sums up his opinion—"In a word, he (James) has aimed to refute those who relied on faith without works, and is too weak for his task in mind, understanding and words, mutilates the Scriptures, and thus contradicts Paul and all Scripture, seeking to accomplish by enforcing the law, what the apostles successfully effect by love. Therefore I will not place his epistle in my Bible among the proper leading books; but will leave it to every one to receive or reject it as he likes; for there are many good sentences in it." That Luther afterwards retracted this unfavourable judgment, which reveals itself also in his version of the Bible in the removal of the epistle of James from its original place at the beginning of the Catholic epistles to their end, where it still stands in all the German Protestant editions, is not at all demonstrable, though it is often asserted (even by Guericke, *Einkl. in's N. T.* p. 499, without any proof).

tioned with a holy reserve, which leaves us with the impression, that far more is thought than is said, and that the cause of this comparative silence is perhaps the wish to gain the more readily some of the Jewish readers to the faith. James calls Christ “the Lord of glory” (ii. 1), and humbly styles himself “a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (i. 1); and he addresses his readers as born again and the first fruits of a new creation (i. 18), thus placing Christianity far above Judaism, and representing it as the creative beginning of a new life. It is the *law* undeniably, but the law spiritualized and glorified by the *gospel*, the “*perfect law of liberty*” (i. 25), which every where meets us in this letter. The genial Herder has characterized the epistle in these striking words:¹ “What a noble man speaks in this epistle! Deep, unbroken patience in suffering! Greatness in poverty! Joy in sorrow! Simplicity, sincerity, firm, direct confidence in prayer! To nothing is he more opposed, than to unbelief, to pusillanimous, destructive subtlety, to double-mindedness. But what a way he has of drawing nigh to God! He speaks of power, the miraculous power of prayer, as of the most certain, unfailing thing, heartily, from experience, with particular instances and proofs—verily a man full of the Holy Ghost, a praying man, a disciple of Jesus!—How well he knows wisdom, and the origin of true and false wisdom in the minds of men! He puts restraint on the tongue, even in its most spacious workings—the tongue, which murders by lusts and passions—silent saint! Nazarite! Disciple of heavenly wisdom! How he wants action! Action! Not words, not (dead intellectual) faith, but free action, perfect, noble action according to the royal law of the Spirit, the free—purified Pharisee, or Essene—the Christian!”

§ 97. *Traditions respecting the other Apostles.*

Peter, Paul, and John were plainly the most influential and efficient of the apostles. Of their labours accordingly we have the most full and reliable accounts, though their end is veiled in mysterious darkness. Besides these none appear in Acts but James the Elder, who soon passed off the stage (A.D. 44) as the

¹ *Brief zweener Brüder Jesu in unserem Kanon.* Lemgo. 1775.

first apostolic martyr, and that other James, who from the year 50, or perhaps even 44, to his death, laboured as head of the church in Jerusalem. Of the activity of the other apostles, on the contrary, the New Testament itself contains no trace; and the many reports respecting them in the writings of the church fathers, and in the pseudo-apostolic acts, are in some cases so strange and so full of contradictions, that they can lay very little claim to credit, and that even the acutest criticism would be unable thoroughly to separate the truth from the error.

The silence of Holy Writ and of authentic history respecting the life and work of the majority of the apostles is an enigma which historians have made various attempts to solve. It may be accounted for first, by the humility of the disciples of Jesus, whose object was not to build for themselves monuments of their fame, but only to labour as instruments of their Master, in whatever way and place He might appoint. Then again, by the fact that they appeared not with the creative originality and imposing personal character of James, Peter, Paul, and John, who fully represent the four ground forms of life and doctrine in the primitive church; but more as simple helpers, quite as necessary, however, and as useful in their sphere as the leaders whose banner they followed. Finally, by the consideration that the destruction of Jerusalem and the persecutions of the Christian church from the time of Nero onward, seriously impeded the recording of their acts and fortunes, or destroyed many documents already written. That these apostles actually laboured, however, with great effect, is certain from the early propagation of Christianity in all parts of the Roman empire, even where we have no sure and special information respecting the mode of its introduction; as in Egypt, North Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Italy out of Rome. Eternity will assuredly disclose many hidden flowers and fruits of Christian life and labour, which are either not at all, or at best very imperfectly recorded in books of history.¹

Down to the apostolic council (A.D. 50) the twelve disciples

¹ We cannot agree, therefore, with Dr Thierseh (*Vorlesungen über Katholic und Protest.* I. p. 203, note, 2d ed.), in explaining the silence of history respecting the majority of the apostles from the *small results* of their labours, especially outside the Roman empire. This would be derogatory to the wisdom and discernment of the Lord in the choice of his instruments.

seem still to have looked on Jerusalem as the centre of their activity, and, with the exception of Paul, not to have gone far beyond Palestine. Thenceforth we find none but James in the Jewish capital (Acts xxi. 18), the rest having scattered to different lands. The story (first found in Rufinus) runs, that they distributed the countries among themselves by lot, and before they separated composed the Apostles' Creed. But this literally understood is a manifest error. More plausible is the tradition that they all, except John, suffered martyrdom,¹ most of them before the destruction of Jerusalem; while the beloved disciple lived down to the threshold of the second century. Most of them seem to have laboured in the different countries of the East, and more in the spirit of James and Peter, than on the principles of the Apostle of the Gentiles. For the Christian churches in Syria, Persia, and India, in Egypt and Ethiopia, exhibit in early antiquity, and even to this day, so remarkable a mixture of Jewish practices with Christian orthodoxy (which, however, in those countries has now become almost a perfect petrification), that we may infer from it with tolerable certainty their Jewish-Christian origin.

Respecting these apostles individually we collect the following statements :—

1. ANDREW, the brother of Simon Peter,² preached (according to Origen in Eusebius) in Scythia; according to later accounts, also in Asia Minor, Thrace, and Achaia. After working many miracles he is supposed to have suffered martyrdom at Patrae (Patras) in Achaia, at the order of the Roman proconsul, Aegeas, whose wife and brother he had converted; and to have been crucified on a *crux decussata* (✕), which thence came to be called “Andrew’s Cross.”

2. PHILIP of Bethsaida,³ not to be confounded with the deacon and evangelist of the same name,⁴ according to a pretty

¹ Yet, according to Heracleon, in Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* IV. p. 502), the apostles Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi (Thaddeus) died a natural death. The whole story above is not found earlier than the fourth century, and may have arisen too from the exaggerated notions of the worth of martyrdom and from the ambiguity of the word *μάρτυρ*, which denotes primarily any confessor of the Christian faith, but commonly, in later usage, a witness by blood.

² Matth. iv. 18; x. 2; xiii. 3; John i. 35, *et seq.*; vi. 8; xii. 22.

³ Matth. x. 3, and parall.; John i. 44, *et seq.*; vi. 5, *et seq.*; xii. 21, *et seq.*; xiv. 8, *et seq.*

⁴ Acts vi. 5; viii. 8, *et seq.*; xxi. 8.

unanimous tradition, performed his last labour in Asia Minor in the province of Phrygia, and died, some say a natural death, others a violent one, at Hierapolis (between Colosse and Laodicea) in a good old age. He survived, it would seem, the destruction of Jerusalem, and according to ancient credible tradition, was married and the father of several pious daughters.¹

3. THOMAS, called Didymus (Twin), probably also from Galilee (comp. John xxi. 2), is presented to us in the Gospel of John² as a man of a melancholy, sceptical, and wilful turn, who would believe only on the palpable testimony of the understanding and of experience, but held fast what he had once come to believe with great decision and fidelity. "My Lord and my God!" cried he in joyful adoration, the moment he put his finger into the wounds of the risen Saviour. He might be taken as the representative of the better class of Rationalists,—those who are honestly seeking truth, and who, therefore, ultimately find it. The oldest tradition (Origen in Euseb.) says, he preached the Gospel in the Parthian empire, and was buried in Edessa; but later accounts (Gregory of Nazianzen, Ambrose, Jerome, and others) place the scene of his labours and martyrdom in East India,³ and the Syrian Christians, who have been found there from time immemorial, regard him as the founder of their church, and hence are called Thomas-Christians.

4. BARTHOLEMEW, or "son of Ptolemaeus,"⁴ is unquestionably the same who appears in the fourth Gospel under his proper name, NATHANAEL (Gift of God, John i. 45, *et seq.*; xxi. 2); the first name being a surname taken from his father, like Simon's surname, Barjona. He sprang from Cana in Galilee (John xxi. 2), and was introduced to the Saviour by Philip. As soon as the Lord saw him, He said of him: "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile."⁵ He is said to have

¹ Eusebius: *H. E.* III. 31; V. 24.

² Ch. xi. 16; xiv. 5; xx. 24-29.

³ But perhaps there is confusion here. At any rate Theodoret (*Haer. fab.* I. 26) represents the Thomas who was sent to the Indians as a disciple of Manes, and the *Acta Thomae*, published by Thilo, betray a Manichean origin.

⁴ Matth. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13.

⁵ John i. 47. This expression of Christ is commonly taken as a general description of the moral and religious character of Nathanael, and explained thus: "Thou art in truth one of the people of God; an Israelite, who answers the idea; such as all should be, all uprightness and ingenuousness." This interpretation, however, we

preached Christianity in India (probably Yemen), where, according to Eusebius, he left the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew; to have laboured also in Lycaonia and Armenia Major; and to have been beheaded, or according to another tradition, crucified with his head downwards.

5. MATTHEW, no doubt the same with LEVI,¹ formerly a tax-gatherer in Galilee (Matth. ix. 9, *et seq.*), author of the first Gospel, is said to have extended the kingdom of God into Ethi-

cannot adopt: (1.) Because it is altogether contrary to the Saviour's custom thus to praise a man to his face. (2.) Because in that case Nathanael's modesty must have compelled him to decline the compliment; whereas, on the contrary, he accepts it without hesitation by asking, "Whence knowest thou me?" ver. 48. (3.) Because ingenuousness and uprightness were never particularly prominent traits in the character of the Jews as a nation, or at any rate of Jacob, in whom, at least in early life, the subtlety of the serpent predominated, as his conduct with Esau and Laban sufficiently shows. "German fidelity" is proverbial, but not "Jewish honesty." The prophets very often rebuke this people for their treachery and hypocrisy (Isaiah xxix. 13, 15; Zeph. i. 11; Ps. l. 19, etc.) (4.) Because this explanation does not suit the connection at all, especially the immediately following words of the Lord, ver. 48, which are evidently to be taken as more particularly defining the former. The sense of this passage, as well as of the whole paragraph, John i. 45-51, can be fully explained only from the history of Jacob, to which Jesus here makes an exceedingly significant allusion. That ver. 51 refers to the heavenly ladder (Gen. xxviii. 12), is conceded by all commentators. The living intercourse of divine and human powers, which appeared to the patriarch under this figure in his dream at Bethel, was perfectly realized in the manifestation of the incarnate Son of God, the Mediator between heaven and earth. Why should not the ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλῆτης, ver. 47, refer likewise to a scene in Jacob's life, to his *victorious wrestling* with his covenant God, when he received the honorary title of *Israel*, Wrestler with God (Gen. xxxii. 28. Comp. Hos. xii. 4), in place of his former name, and in token of his having put off the old man? We conceive the matter thus: Nathanael, a disciple of John, and by him directed to the Messiah, was engaged, under the shade of a fig-tree—perhaps in the place which tradition assigns for Jacob's wrestling—in the study of the law and the prophets, and absorbed in fervent prayer for the coming of the long-promised Saviour, when Philip approached him with the joyful tidings of the Messiah, whom he had found. The Lord had looked into his heart—had read there his hopes and prayers for the Messiah (ver. 48); and this surprising insight into the secrets of his soul, in connection with what preceded, led Nathanael to faith. The sense of the words in question will, therefore, be simply, "Behold a man, who has just wrestled with God with unfeigned earnestness in prayer for the manifestation of the Messiah, and has prevailed;" or, to keep closer to the Old Testament passage here in mind, Gen. xxxii. 28, "Thou art no deceiver (Jacob), but an honest wrestler with God (Israel); for thou hast wrestled with God, that He would send the Saviour of the world, and show Him to thee; and thy prayer is heard. The Messiah stands before thee." That all the ensuing circumstances, the question of the astonished Nathanael, the Lord's reply, the confession of faith, and the reference to the new ladder from heaven, of which Jacob's was but a faint type—that all these come along very naturally in this view, is plain enough.

¹ Mark ii. 14. Luke v. 27. Matth. x. 3, etc.

opia (Meroe), and according to some accounts into the countries of Asia. Respecting the manner and place of his death the reports vary.

6. SIMON ZELOTES appears in the New Testament only in the lists of the apostles (Matth. x. 4, and parall.), and there are different stories about his labours. Some church fathers identify him with Symeon, son of Clopas, who, according to Eusebius, succeeded James as bishop of Jerusalem, and was crucified under Trajan in the hundred and twentieth year of his age. According to Nicephorus, on the contrary, Simon preached in Egypt, Cyrene, Mauritania, Lybia, and at last in the British Isles, where he was crucified. Finally, Abdias tells us that he, with Judas Thaddeus, was taken to Persia and Babylon, and murdered at Sunir.

7. JUDAS, also called LEBBAEUS and THADDEUS (Matth. x. 3, etc.), preached, as the western tradition has it, in Persia, and there, through the instigation of the magicians, met a cruel death. Nicephorus, on the contrary, makes him preach in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, and die a natural death at Edessa.

8. MATTHIAS, one of the seventy disciples (according to Eusebius), who, on the motion of Peter, was chosen by lot to fill the place of Judas Iscariot (Acts i. 15–26), is said to have laboured and suffered martyrdom in Ethiopia; while other accounts say he was stoned by the Jews in Judea.

9. JAMES THE LESS, or JAMES *the son of Alphaeus*,¹ laboured, according to the tradition of the Greek church, which distinguishes him from James the brother of the Lord, the bishop of Jerusalem and author of the catholic epistle (comp. § 95), first in the south-western part of Palestine, afterwards in Egypt, and was crucified at Ostracine in lower Egypt.²

§ 98. *Destruction of Jerusalem.* A.D. 70.

The forbearance of God with his covenant people, who had crucified their own Saviour, at last reached its limit. As many as could be saved in the usual way were rescued. The mass of the people had obstinately set themselves against all improvement. James the Just, the man who was fitted, if any could

¹ Mark xv. 40; Matth. x. 3; xxvii. 56; Acts i. 13.

² Nicephor. II. 40.

be, to reconcile the Jews to the Christian religion, had been stoned by his hardened brethren, for whom he daily interceded in the temple; and with him the Christian community in Jerusalem had lost its importance for that city. The hour of fearful judgment drew near. The prophecy of the Lord¹ approached its literal fulfilment.

Not long before the outbreak of the Jewish war, seven years before the siege of Jerusalem, a man by the name of Jesus came to the city at the feast of tabernacles, and in a fit of absent-mindedness constantly cried among the people: "Woe to the city! Woe to the temple! A voice from the morning, a voice from the evening! A voice from the four winds! A voice against Jerusalem and the temple! A voice against bridegroom and bride! A voice against the whole people!" Some magistrates, terrified by this, had the man taken up and scourged. He offered no resistance, and continued to cry his "Woe." Being brought before the procurator, Albinus, he was scourged till his bones could be seen, but interposed not a word for himself; uttered no curse on his enemies; simply exclaimed at every blow in a mournful tone: "Woe, woe to Jerusalem!" To the governor's question, who and whence he was, he answered nothing. Finally they let him go, as a madman. But he continued till the outbreak of the war, especially at the three great feasts, to proclaim the approaching fall of Jerusalem. During the siege he was singing his dirge for the last time from the wall. Suddenly he added, "Woe, woe also to me!"—and a missile put an end to his prophetic lamentation.

Under the last governors, Felix, Festus, Albinus and Florus, moral corruption and the dissolution of all social ties, but at the same time the oppressiveness of the Roman yoke, increased every year. After the accession of Felix, assassins, the "Sicarians" (from *sica*, a dagger) armed with daggers, and purchasable for any crime, endangering safety in city and country, roamed over Palestine. Besides this, the party spirit amongst the Jews themselves, and their hatred of their heathen oppressors rose to the most insolent political and religious fanaticism, and was continually inflamed by false prophets and Messiahs, one of

¹ Matth. xxiv. 1, 2. Luke xix. 43, 44.

whom, for example, according to Josephus, drew after him thirty thousand men (comp. Acts xxi. 38). At last, in the year 66, under the last procurator, Gessius Florus (from 65 onward), a wicked and cruel tyrant, who, as Josephus says, was placed as a hangman over evil-doers, there began an organized rebellion against the Romans, but at the same time a terrible civil war also between the zealots and the conservatives, as well as between different parties of the revoltors themselves. The Christian, remembering the Lord's admonition (Matth. xxiv. 15, *et seq.*), forsook Jerusalem and fled to the town of Pella beyond the Jordan, in the north of Perea, where king Herod Agrippa II., before whom Paul once stood, opened to them a safe asylum. An old tradition¹ says, that a divine voice reminded their most prominent members once more of the flight. The emperor Nero, informed of this rebellion, sent the famous general, Vespasian, with a large force to Palestine. Vespasian opened the campaign in the year 67 from the Syrian port-town Ptolemais (Acco), and, against a stout resistance, overran Galilee with an army of sixty thousand men. But events in Rome hindered him from completing the tragedy, and required him to return thither. Nero had killed himself. The emperors Galba, Otho, and Vitellius followed one another in rapid succession. The latter was taken out of a dog's kennel in Rome drunk, dragged through the streets, and shamefully put to death, and Vespasian, in the year 69, was universally proclaimed emperor.

His son, Titus, who himself ten years after became emperor, and highly distinguished himself by his mildness and philanthropy, then undertook the prosecution of the Jewish war, and became the instrument in the hand of God of destroying the holy city and the temple. In April, A.D. 70, immediately after Easter, when Jerusalem was filled with strangers, the siege began. The zealots rejected with sneering defiance the repeated proposals of Titus and the prayers of Josephus, who accompanied him as interpreter and mediator; and they struck down every one who spoke of surrender. Even the famine, which now began to rage and sweep away thousands daily, the cries of mothers and babes, the most pitiable and continually increasing

¹ In Eusebius, *H. E.* III. 5.

misery around them, could not move the crazy fanatics. History records no other instance of such obstinate resistance, such desperate bravery and contempt of death. For the Jews fought, not only for civil liberty, life, and their native land, but for that which constituted their national pride and glory, and gave their whole history its significance,—for their religion, which even in this state of horrible degeneracy infused into them an almost superhuman power of endurance and a fearful inspiration. At last in July the castle of Antonia was surprised and taken by night. The Roman general proposed to keep that magnificent work of art, the temple, to grace his triumph; but he was again insultingly repulsed. The famine was so severe, that many swallowed their jewels; a mother even roasted her own child; but the wretches would hear nothing of mercy. When Titus finally ordered the temple halls to be set on fire, he still wished to save the venerable sanctuary. But its destruction was determined by a higher decree. In a fresh assault, a soldier unbidden hurled a firebrand through the golden door. When the flame arose, the Jews raised a hideous yell and tried to put out the fire; while others, clinging with a last, convulsive grasp to their Messianic hopes, rested in the declaration of a false prophet, that God in the midst of the conflagration of the temple would give the signal for the deliverance of his people. Titus himself gave repeated orders to have the fire extinguished. But in vain. His legions vied with each other in feeding the flame, and made the unhappy people feel the whole weight of their unchained rage. At first the vast stream of blood from the bodies heaped up before the altar of burnt-offering restrained the fire; but soon the whole prodigious structure was in flames. It was burnt on the tenth of August, A.D. 70, the same day of the year on which according to tradition the first temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. “No one,” says Josephus, “can conceive of a louder, more terrible shriek, than arose from all sides during the burning of the temple. The shout of victory and the jubilee of the legions sounded through the wailings of the people upon the mountain and throughout the city. The echo from all the mountains around, even to Perea, increased the deafening roar. Yet the *sight* was equally terrible. The mountain seemed as if enveloped to its base in one sheet of flame. On the top the

earth was nowhere visible. All was covered with corpses ; over these heaps the soldiers pursued the fugitives." The same author gives the number of Jews slain at the siege of Jerusalem as one million one hundred thousand ; and the number sold into slavery during the war, ninety thousand !

Even the heathen Titus publicly exclaimed, that *God* aided the Romans and drove the Jews from their impregnable strongholds. The Jew, Josephus, a learned priest and Pharisee, who has described the whole Jewish war at length in seven books, and who went through it himself from beginning to end, at first as governor of Galilee, then as a prisoner of Vespasian, finally as a companion of Titus and mediator between the Romans and Jews, recognized in this tragical event a divine judgment, and admitted of his degenerate countrymen, to whom he was otherwise attached in sincere love : "I will not hesitate to say what gives me pain : I believe, that, had the Romans delayed their punishment of that ungodly people, the city would have been swallowed up by the earth, or overwhelmed with a flood, or, like Sodom, consumed with fire from heaven. For the generation which was in it, was far more ungodly than the men on whom those punishments had in former times fallen. By their madness, the whole nation is ruined." Thus, therefore, must one of the best Roman emperors execute the long-threatened judgment of God, and the most learned Jew of his time describe it, and thereby, without willing or knowing it, bear testimony to the truth of the word, and the divinity of the mission of Jesus Christ, the rejection of whom brought all this and the subsequent misfortune upon the apostate "royal priesthood."

This awful catastrophe, which prefigured in miniature the final judgment, must have given the Christian churches a shock, of which we now, especially in the absence of all particular information respecting it, can hardly form a true conception. This actual refutation of stiff-necked Judaism, this divine ratification and sealing of Christianity, the confessors of which were all rescued from the ruin, not only gave a mighty impulse to faith, but at the same time formed a proper epoch in the history of the relation between the two religious bodies. It separated them for ever. It is true, the apostle Paul had before now inwardly completed this separation by the Christian universality of his whole

system of doctrine ; but outwardly he had in various ways accommodated himself to Judaism, and had more than once religiously visited the temple. He wished not to appear as a revolutionist, nor to anticipate the natural course of history, the ways of Providence (1 Cor. vii. 18, *et seq.*) But now the rupture was also outwardly consummated by the thunderbolt of divine omnipotence. God himself destroyed the house, in which he had thus far dwelt ; rejected his peculiar people for their obstinate rejection of the Messiah ; demolished the whole fabric of the Mosaic theocracy, whose system of worship was, in its very nature, associated exclusively with the tabernacle at first and afterwards with the temple ; but in so doing cut the cords which had hitherto bound, and according to the law of organic development *necessarily* bound, the infant church, especially the Jewish portion of it, to the outward economy of the old covenant, and to Jerusalem as its centre. Henceforth the heathen could no longer look upon Christianity as a mere sect of Judaism, but must regard and treat it as a new, peculiar religion. The destruction of Jerusalem, therefore, marks that momentous crisis, at which the Christian church as a whole burst forth for ever from the chrysalis of legalism, awoke to a sense of its maturity, and in government and worship at once took its independent stand before the world.¹ This breaking away from hardened Judaism and its religious forms, however, involved no departure from the spirit of the Old Testament revelation. The church, on the contrary, entered into the inheritance of Israel. The Christians appeared as genuine Jews, who, following the inward current of the Mosaic religion, had found Him, who was the fulfilment of the law and the prophets ; the perfect fruit of the old covenant and the living germ of the new ; the beginning and the all-sufficient principle of a new moral creation.

It now only remained to complete the organization of the church in this altered state of things ; to combine the premises in their results ; to take up the conservative tendency of Peter, and the progressive tendency of Paul, as embodied respectively in the Jewish Christian and the Gentile Christian churches, and

¹ Comp. the excellent remarks of Dr Richard Rothe (*Die Anfänge der Christl. Kirche und ihrer Verfassung*, vol. i. p. 341, *et seq.*), which Schwegler (*Nachapost. Zeitalter*, II. p. 190), endeavours in vain to refute.

fuse them into a third and higher tendency in a permanent organism ; to set forth alike the unity of the two Testaments in diversity, and their diversity in unity ; and in this way to wind up the history of the apostolic church. This was the work of John, the apostle of completion.

CHAPTER V.

LIFE AND WORK OF JOHN.

§ 99. *Parentage and Education of John.*

THE close of the apostolic age and the transition to the succeeding period is formed by the activity of the beloved disciple and bosom friend of Jesus. Him the Lord had appointed to give the finishing stroke to the internal and external organization of His church.

The apostle and evangelist JOHN,¹ was the son of Zebedee, a Galilean fisherman, and Salome, and a brother of the elder James. His birth-place was probably that of Peter, Andrew, and Philip, the fishing town of Bethsaida.² His parents seem to have been not altogether without means. His father kept hired servants (Mark i. 20). His mother was one of the women who supported Jesus with their property³ and purchased spices to embalm him.⁴ John himself owned a house in Jerusalem, into which he received the mother of the Lord after the crucifixion (John xix. 27). The seeds of piety were no doubt planted in his youthful heart by his pious mother. Salome shared, indeed, at that time, still in the carnal Messianic hopes of the Jews, and had somewhat of vanity withal; as appears from her asking of the Lord in behalf of her two sons the highest places in His kingdom (Matth. xx. 20, *et seq.*) Yet she was a faithful follower of Jesus, not forsaking Him even when He hung on the cross (Mark xv. 40).⁵ Like all the other apostles, except Paul, John

¹ From the Heb. יְהוֹנָן, *i. e.*, Grace of Jehovah (Gotthold).

² Matth. iv. 21; x. 2. Mark i. 19; iii. 17; x. 35. Luke v. 10. Acts xii. 2.

³ Matth. xxvii. 56. Mark xv. 40, *et seq.* Luke viii. 3.

⁴ Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiii. 55, 56.

⁵ According to the new interpretation of John xix. 25, presented with acuteness and learning by Wieseler in the "Studien und Kritiken," 1840, No. 3, p. 648, *et seq.*,

grew up without a learned or scientific education (comp. Acts iv. 13). All this deficiency was destined to be amply supplied by a three years' personal intercourse with the Master of all masters, and by the supernatural illumination of the Holy Ghost. But he was no doubt early made familiar with the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, which gave his natural turn for profound reflection, and his fine tender feeling, far more wholesome exercise, than the learning of the Pharisaic schools, corrupted as it was with all sorts of dangerous maxims.

In his youth he became a disciple of John the Baptist. For he is undoubtedly the one not named of the two disciples of John, of whom he himself speaks in his Gospel, i. 35, *et seq.* His susceptible soul, longing for the Hope of Israel, must soon have discerned a messenger of God in the earnest preacher of repentance, who preceded Christ like the dawn before the sun. By this herald, on the banks of the Jordan in Perea, he, together with Andrew, was directed to Jesus as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. From his first interview with the Saviour, he received so deep an impression, that he remembered even in his old age that hour of meeting (John i. 39). After one day's intercourse with the Son of God he returned with Peter and Andrew to his home and trade. There the good seed, which had fallen into his heart, had opportunity to germinate and unfold itself freely. It was part of the Lord's great wisdom as a teacher to do no violence to the course of nature in drawing His disciples to Him. Soon after this John, with James, Peter, and Andrew, was called away from his occupation by Jesus to be one of His constant followers and apostles.¹ Thus John is the representative of those disciples, who are gradually

Salome would be the sister of the mother of Jesus, and thus John a cousin of the Lord. By "his mother's sister" Wieseler understands, not, as the common interpretation makes it, Mary the wife of Cleophas (since it is altogether improbable that two sisters would have the same name), but John's own mother, who is known from the parallel passages, Matth. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40, to have been present in fact at the crucifixion, and could hardly have been passed over by her son; and who is here thus designated in a way exactly corresponding to John's manner of indicating himself ("the disciple whom Jesus loved"). There are considerable difficulties, however, in the way of this explanation. Comp. Neander's *Apostelgesch.* II. 609; my tract on James, p. 22, *et seq.*; and the article on John, by W. Grimm, in *Ersch* and *Gruber's Encyklop.*, Sect. II., Part 22, p. 1, *et seq.*

¹ Matth. iv. 18, *et seq.* Mark i. 16, *et seq.* Luke iv. 1-11.

drawn into fellowship with the Redeemer without any violent inward struggles or unusual outward changes ; while the apostle Paul furnishes the most striking example of a sudden conversion. The first mode of conversion is especially suited to mild, contemplative, modest characters, such as Thomas à Kempis, Melancthon, Spener, Bengel, Zinzendorf ; the other, to such strong, impetuous, resolute, independent natures, as Tertullian, Augustine, Luther, Farel, and Calvin.

John, whose soul was formed for deep friendship and ardent love, was one of the most confidential disciples of the Lord. He, his brother James, and Simon Peter, were the chosen from among the chosen ; the holy triad, upon whom the Saviour bestowed special favour. They alone were admitted to witness the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mark v. 37), the transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor (Matth. xvii. 1), and his agony in Gethsemane (Matth. xxvi. 37 ; Mark xiv. 33). The ground of this preference must be looked for, partly in the Lord's sovereign choice, partly in the peculiar character of the three disciples. Of James we know very little. He seems to have been of a quiet, earnest, meditative turn, and in the year 44, as before noticed, he headed the band of apostolic martyrs. His place was filled in a measure, as regards prominence and influence, by the apostle Paul. Peter we have already seen to be an ardent, impetuous man, of great energy, made for the practical superintendence of the church. John makes not so much outward show ; but the flame of love burned the brighter and warmer within. His deep, affectionate nature, which gave him his peculiar religious genius, placed him above the two others, and made him the dearest of the Saviour's three chosen friends. His was the great privilege of leaning on Jesus' bosom,¹ and listening to the heart-beatings of eternal mercy (John xiii. 23). In his Gospel, therefore, in modest self-concealment, and at the same time under a sense of the deepest gratitude, he designates him-

¹ Hence he is styled by the Greek church fathers, *ὁ ἐπιστήθιος*, the leaner on the bosom, or as we would say, the bosom friend of Jesus. Very beautifully says Augustine of the evangelist John, "He only poured forth the water of life, which he had drunk. For not without reason is it related of him in his own Gospel, that he lay on the bosom of the Lord at the supper also. From this bosom he quietly drank ; and what he thus enjoyed in secret, he has given to the world to partake of." (*Tract. 36, in Joann.*)

self as “the disciple whom Jesus loved.”¹ This is probably a significant paraphrase and interpretation of his proper name, in which he saw a prophecy of this perfect friendship, of his enjoyment of the special favour of Christ, the incarnate Jehovah.²

John showed his fidelity to the Lord in the hour of his suffering, following him with Peter into the palace of the high-priest (John xviii. 19). He was the only one of all the disciples who attended the crucifixion; and to him, as best fitted to take the place of her child, Jesus committed his mother (xix. 26). He took Mary to his house (ver. 27), and according to tradition kept her till her death, which is said by Nicephorus to have taken place at Jerusalem (according to other accounts at Ephesus) in the year 48. On the morning of the resurrection, accompanied again by Peter, he hastened to the sepulchre and found it empty (xx. 3, *et seq.*) The last time he meets us in the Gospels he is on the sea of Gennesaret with six other disciples engaged in fishing the whole night; but their labour was all in vain, when their risen Master appeared to them and helped them out of their strait by a miracle; thus hinting to them, that, in the apostolic career before them, in the great work of catching men, nothing could be accomplished by mere human power, but all depended on the word of their Lord. The difference between John and Peter in their conduct on this occasion is remarkable. The former at once recognizes the Lord with the keen glance of love, but remains quietly in the ship, certain of his possession, and all-absorbed in thinking of it; while the impulsive Peter, now particularly restless under the consciousness of his denial and his anxiety for explicit pardon, plunges into the waves and swims to the feet of Jesus on the shore, to reach him first (John xxi. 2, *et seq.*) So the contemplative Mary in calm hope waited for the Lord at home, while her busy sister, Martha, ran to meet him and tell him her grief (xi. 20).

§ 100. *His Apostolic Labours.*

In the Acts of the Apostles John appears, next to Peter, as the most important personage in the first or Jewish-Christian stage of the apostolic church. By reason of his peculiar tempera-

¹ John xiii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20.

² Comp. John xii. 41, with Isaiah vi. 1.

ment, however, he does not come out so prominently as Peter either by speech or action, but keeps by the side of the senior apostle in silent contemplation. With Peter he heals the cripple (Acts iii. 1, *et seq.*); is sent with him to Samaria, to confirm by the impartation of the Holy Ghost the Christians there baptized by the deacon, Philip (viii. 14, *et seq.*); and thence returns to Jerusalem. Here, in the year 50, he meets Paul, who had come to consult with the elder apostles on the authority of the law of Moses. Paul speaks of him and James and Peter as apostles of the circumcision, and as pillars of the church (Gal. ii. 1-9). Thus far, then, John seems to have confined his labours to the Jews and to Palestine. Yet he undoubtedly already had in him the germs of a reconciliation of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. For we never find the Judaizers appealing to him, as the Cephas party to Peter (1 Cor. i. 12), or the still stricter Jewish Christians to James (Gal. ii. 12); nor have we any hint of a proper Johannean party. He stood above strife and division. When Paul made his last visit to Jerusalem in 58, the favourite disciple was no longer there, or Luke would certainly have mentioned him (Acts xxi. 18); and for his subsequent history we are left to his own writings and the tradition of the church.

John afterwards fixed the permanent seat of his labour in the renowned commercial city of Ephesus, thus in one of the most important of Paul's congregations. This fact is placed beyond question by the unanimous testimony of Christian antiquity;¹ and from the epistles of the Revelation (i. 11; ii. and iii.), it would appear, that he had supervision of the churches of Asia Minor in general. The time of his removal to Grecian soil cannot be precisely determined. The most we can say is, that it was not till after, or at all events not long before, the death of Paul. For in Paul's valedictory to the officers of the Ephesian churches at Miletus there is not a syllable about John, nor in his epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians and the second to Timothy, written during his confinement in Rome. In all these

¹ Irenæus (the disciple of Polycarp, who was personally acquainted with John), *Adv. Haer.* III. 1, 3, etc., and his letter to Florinus in Eusebius, *H. E.* V. 20; also Clemens Alex., in his homily, *quis dives salvetur*, c. 42; Apollonius and Polycrates of Ephesus at the close of the second century (in *Euseb.* V. 18, 24, and III. 31); Origen, Eusebius, etc. Nothing but the crazy scepticism of the deist, Lützelberger, could in the face of all this testimony pronounce John's residence at Ephesus a fiction.

Paul evidently regards himself still as superintendent of the whole church of Asia Minor. It was probably the martyrdom of the Apostle of the Gentiles in 64, and the attendant dangers and distractions long anticipated by himself (Acts xx. 29, 30), that led John to take this important post, and build his own structure on the foundation laid by Paul. Where he spent the interval between the years 50 and 64, cannot be ascertained.¹

The vigorous life of the second century, which bears the impress of John's influence, clearly shows that Asia Minor was destined to be the main theatre of the church's action in the next stadium of her history. There were collected all the forces necessary to bring about a thorough purification,—the germs of the two grand fundamental heresies, which the church was to overcome. On the one hand the spirit of Pharisaical Judaism threatened a new bondage to the law, particularly in the Galatian churches. On the other there arose from a combination of heathen and Jewish elements a false Gnosis, a tendency to licentious speculation, which had been already opposed in the epistles to Timothy and the Colossians, as also in the second epistle of Peter and in Jude, and which afterwards took a more definite and tangible form in the hands of Cerinthus, a younger contemporary of John. But not only from heretics was the church in danger. The Jewish and Gentile believers had not yet rightly grown together in firm, organic unity. The Jewish converts had not yet ceased to look with a certain suspicion on the liberal stand of Paul and his disciples towards the law; so that Peter found it necessary in his epistles to the churches of that region to assert his essential agreement in faith with the Apostle of the Gentiles (comp. § 91). In this critical state of things John was the very person to check the progress of the dangerous errors, and fundamentally to refute them, not in a simply negative way, but positively also, by meeting with truth the real wants from which they sprang. As a native of Palestine and formerly one of the apostles of the Jews, he had the confidence of the Jewish Chris-

¹ The later report of his having carried the gospel to the Parthians must have arisen from the inscription, "Ad Parthos," on some Latin manuscripts of the first epistle of John; and this again from a misunderstanding of the epithet *παρθένος* anciently given to this apostle on account of his celibacy. Comp. Lücke, *Comment. z. d. Br. Joh.*, 2d edit. p. 28, *et seq.*

tians ; and his intellectual susceptibility and plasticity enabled him readily to appropriate the Hellenistic element and adapt himself to Paul's position. And by thus reconciling in himself these two ground-forms of apostolical Christianity, so far as they were but different aspects of one and the same truth, he secured to the whole church of Asia Minor that compact and well-fortified unity so needful to maintain her against the enemies within, as well as against bloody persecutions from without.

§ 101. *Persecution under Domitian. Banishment of John to Patmos.*

In this benign labour, the monuments of which stand before us in his Gospel and Epistles, John was interrupted by the persecution under Domitian, to work for the kingdom of God in another way by unveiling the mysteries of the future.

Domitian succeeded his brother Titus and reigned from A.D. 81 to his assassination in 96. He was totally unlike his predecessor. He made a happy beginning, but soon showed himself a consummate tyrant, not awhit behind Nero in cruelty, while he surpassed him in hypocrisy. Just when he seemed most friendly and condescending, was he most to be feared for his thirst for blood. He killed or banished the most upright and distinguished men, even senators and consuls, upon the idlest pretexts, when they fell under his dark suspicion, or stood in the way of his insatiable ambition. Self-deification he carried to the summit of blasphemy. He was the first Roman emperor after Caligula to arrogate the name of God. He began his letters with the words : "Our Lord and God commands," and required his subjects to address him so.¹ Nay, he put himself above the gods, and ordered gold and silver statues of himself to be placed in the holiest part of the temple, and whole herds of victims to be sacrificed to him.² Such a man could not but look upon the confessing of Christ as a treasonable offence. Under his reign many Christians suffered martyrdom, among whom was his own cousin, the consul Flavius Clemens.³ His jealousy led him also to de-

¹ Suetonius, *Domit.*, ch. 13 : " 'Dominus et Deus noster hoc fieri jubet.' Unde institutum posthac, ut ne scripto quidem ac sermone cujusquam appellaretur aliter."

² Pliny, *Panegy.*, ch. 52, cf. 33.

³ The pagan historian, Dio Cassius (in the abridgment by Xiphilinus, 67, 14), says,

stroy the surviving descendants of David, and to bring two kinsmen of Jesus from Palestine to Rome ; fearing their aspirations, till he convinced himself, that they were poor, innocent persons, from whom he had nothing to apprehend.¹

Under this emperor, John, according to tradition, was banished to the solitary, barren, rocky island of Patmos (now Patmo or Palmosa) in the Ægean sea, near the coast of Asia, south-west of Ephesus. There he received the Revelation of the struggles and victories of the church.² That he had the vision while an exile on this island he himself informs us, Rev. i. 9 : “ I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ.” And that it was in the reign of Domitian is the almost unanimous testimony of Christian antiquity ; with which also the contents of the book itself, rightly understood, are by no means inconsistent. The oldest witness is Irenæus, who merits special regard as a pupil of Polycarp, who was a per-

“ In the same year Domitian put to death, besides many others, Flavius Clemens, of consular dignity, though he was his cousin, and married to Domitilla, who was likewise related to him. Both were charged with atheism. On this ground many others, who had strayed away to the customs of the Jews (*i. e.*, converts to Christianity), were condemned. Some had to die, others were deprived of their property. Domitilla was only banished to the island of Pandateria ” (in the bay of Puteoli, near Naples). By atheism here is no doubt to be understood the denial of the heathen deities, the Christian faith. Comp. the passages in Gieseler’s *Kirchengesch.* I. 1, p. 135. Christian tradition places the martyrdom of Andrew, Mark, Onesimus, and Dionysius the Areopagite also in the time of Domitian’s persecution.

¹ Hegesippus, in Euseb. *H. E.* III. 19, 20. According to Tertullian (*De praeser. haer.*, c. 36), John was brought to Rome (he does not say by what emperor), plunged into a caldron of boiling oil, and, unhurt by this, was banished to the island of Patmos (“ ubi—*i. e.* at Rome—apost. Joh., posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur”). His being tortured in this way is, indeed, in itself by no means improbable, considering the unnatural cruelties said by Tacitus and Juvenal to have been inflicted on the Christians in the Neronian persecution. But, as Tertullian is not very discriminating in historical matters, and as the statement in question is made by no one else save Jerome, and by him on the authority of Tertullian, we cannot place any reliance upon it, and are disposed, with many, to class it at least among exaggerated stories.

² At the harbour de la Scala, the grotto is still pointed out where the beloved disciple beheld in ecstatic vision, “ on the Lord’s day,” the future of the church. Tischendorf thus describes the island (*Reise in’s Morgenland*, II. p. 257, *et seq.* : “ Silent lay the little island before me in the morning twilight. Here and there an olive breaks the monotony of the rocky waste. The sea was still as the grave ; Patmos reposed in it like a dead saint. . . . John—that is the thought of the island. The island belongs to him ; it is his sanctuary. Its stones preach of him, and in every heart he lives.”

sonal friend of John. He says explicitly and with great confidence, that the revelation was received not long before, in fact almost within the limits of his generation, that is, towards the end of Domitian's reign.¹ With him agrees Eusebius, who, in several passages of his Church History, on the authority of ancient tradition, assigns the banishment of John to the reign of this emperor, in his Chronicle to the fourteenth year of it (*i. e.*, A.D. 95); and places the apostle's return to Ephesus in the reign of Nerva.² So Jerome³ and others. Two earlier witnesses, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who would come immediately after Irenæus in time, do not, it is true, give the name of the emperor who banished the apostle, but designate him, the former as a "tyrant,"⁴ the latter still more indefinitely, as "king of the Romans."⁵ Both phrases, however, suit Domitian as well as Nero; the expression "tyrant" better, since of all the Roman emperors Domitian was the most arrant despot. Tacitus says of him, that he "laboured not only at intervals, by paroxysms, but systematically, to demolish the commonwealth as at one blow."⁶ To him Eusebius also referred the passage of Clement.

¹ *Adv. haer.* V. 30: Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἐωράθη (ἡ ἀποκάλυψις), ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς. Guericke's hypothesis, which, contrary to all rules of grammar, would make Δομετιανοῦ an adjective, and refer it to Domitius Nero (*Einl. in's N. T.* p. 285), to reconcile the passage with his present opinion respecting the date of the Apocalypse (for formerly, in his "Beiträgen zur Einl.," p. 55, and his "Fortgesetzten Beiträgen," p. 30, he had advocated the true view), is utterly untenable, in view even of the immediately preceding context, which does not at all suit the time of Nero, who lived a full century before Irenæus wrote his work against the Gnostics. The absence of the article is not in the least against the word being a substantive; since Eusebius, where he confessedly uses it for Domitian, likewise leaves out the article, *H. E.* III. 23: Μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανοῦ τελευτήν. So Philostratus, *Vita Apoll.* VII. 4: Τῆς Δομετιανοῦ φορᾶς.

² *H. E.* III. 18: "Under him (Domitian), according to tradition, the then surviving apostle and evangelist, John, on account of his testimony for the word of God, was condemned to dwell on the island of Patmos." Also III. 20, 23, and *Chron. ad ann.* 14 Domitiani.

³ *De viris illustr.*, ch. 9: "Johannes quarto decimo anno secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano in Patmos insulam relegatus scripsit Apocalypsin."

⁴ *Quis dives salv.*, ch. 42, and in Euseb. *H. E.* III. 23: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετέλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσον.

⁵ *Orig. ad Matt.* xx. 22, 23. Opp. ed. de la Rue, III. 720. Respecting this testimony, comp. the observations of Hengstenberg, *Commentar über die Offenbarung des heil. Joh.* I. p. 4, *et seq.* (Translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library), who, against the modern criticism, ably defends the old view, that the book was composed in the time of Domitian.

⁶ *Agric.*, ch. 44. Comp. Pliny's portrait of this "inmanissima bellua," *Paneg.* c. 48.

The uncritical and credulous Epiphanius is the first to deviate from this view. He puts the banishment of John in the reign of Claudius. But he has no support from any quarter, and has accordingly never been followed.¹

On the other hand, the authority of Ewald, Lücke, and Neander in modern times, has given considerable popularity to the view, that the Apocalypse (which, however, is not regarded by these scholars as the work of the apostle John) was written in the reign of Galba, A.D. 68 or 69, soon after the death of Nero.² The only other witness for this, of any account, is the Syriac translator of this book,³ who does not, however, appeal to tradition at all, and probably founds his statement merely on his own view of the contents. In either case his authority bears no comparison with that of the much older Irenæus. And in fact the modern interpreters determine the date from evidence altogether *internal*. They seem to find in the Apocalypse itself plain indications that it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem (ch. xi.), in lively remembrance of the

¹ We cannot, therefore, justify Dr Lücke and Dr Davidson in speaking of a "*vacillation* of the church tradition concerning the date of the exile and Apocalypse" (*Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbar. Joh.* p. 409). On this point *tradition*, so far as it has any historical weight, is unanimous. The only deviations are individual opinions, which even contradict one another.

² This was the opinion already of Herder (*Maranatha*, p. 207), who held the Apocalypse to be genuine, but erroneously referred its contents to the destruction of Jerusalem. Of English theologians I see that Dr Davidson, in his learned article on "*Revelation*" in *Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii. p. 621, *et seq.* (Amer. ed.), adopts the false view that the book was written during the reign of Nero, and is much too hasty, when he says—"The tradition of the early church in regard to the banishment of John is neither consistent nor valuable; it will not stand the test of modern criticism. Hence the view of those who think that it was manufactured solely from ch. i. 9, is exceedingly probable."

³ In the title, "*Revelatio, quam Deus Joanni Evangelistae in Patmo insula dedit, in quam a Nerone Cæsare relegatus fuerat.*" The Syriac translation of the Apocalypse, however, is wanting in the original Peshito and belongs to the Philoxeniana, or rather to its recension by Thomas. It therefore dates only from the seventh century, according to a Florentine MS. from the year 622 (comp. Hug's *Einleit. in's N. T.* I. p. 353, *et seq.*, and De Wette's *Einl. in's N. T.* § 11. *a.*); and its isolated statement respecting the date of the Apocalypse has, therefore, in reality no critical value at all. Still less regard is due in this matter to Theophylact of the twelfth century. He evidently confounds two things entirely different. In his Commentary on John's Gospel, he takes the *Gospel* of John (not the Apocalypse) to have been composed in the island of Patmos thirty-two years after the ascension of Christ, therefore under Nero, whom, however, he does not name; an opinion universally rejected. How Guericke, then, in this connection (*Einl.* p. 285), can speak of Theophylact as a "discriminating critic," I cannot conceive.

persecution under Nero and the burning of Rome, and during the reign of the sixth Roman emperor (Galba), before the supposed return of Nero (to whom several moderns altogether erroneously apply the number 666) in the character of Antichrist (c. 17). But this internal evidence is here the less decisive, because the interpretation of this mysterious book as a whole, and of this section in particular, is yet in dispute.¹ With fully as much, yea with more right we might infer from the state of the churches in Asia Minor, as described in the seven epistles, and especially from the existence of the Gnostic sect of the Nicolaitans, that the revelation could not have been written long before the close of the first century. Besides, Nero's persecution falls not in the year 67, as is so frequently assumed from the false reckoning of Eusebius, but according to the clear testimony of Tacitus in the year 64 (comp. § 88); was of short duration; and on account of its local occasion—the setting fire to the city falsely charged upon the Christians—was perhaps confined to Rome. At least there is not the slightest historical proof that it extended to the provinces, and in particular to Asia Minor, until we come to Orosius in the beginning of the fifth century; and his testimony is of no account, since he in other matters merely copies Suetonius. Finally, we know nothing of Nero's having punished the Christians with banishment: while Dio Cassius says expressly that Domitian banished to Pandateria his relative Flavia Domitilla, the wife of the above named Clemens (Eusebius says his niece—unless we suppose two women of this name), on account of atheism (*ἀθεότης*), that is, the Christian faith.²

In this state of the case we adhere to the oldest and most prevalent view of the date of John's banishment, and of the date of the Apocalypse therewith connected. Irenæus had the best opportunity to collect authentic accounts of this fact from one who, like Polycarp, was a personal friend and pupil of the apostle.

¹ Against this comp. Dr J. Chr. K. Hoffmann's *Weissagung und Erfüllung* (1841), II. p. 301, *et seq.*, and, for a detailed discussion, the Commentary of Hengstenberg and the introduction to it, I. p. 27, *et seq.*

² Dio, B. 67, 14; comp. 68, 1, and Euseb. *H. E.* III. 18. Banishment was with Domitian a favourite punishment. Tacitus congratulates Agricola, that he did not live to see under this emperor "*tot consularium caedes, tot nobilissimarum feminarum exilia et fugas*" (*Vit. Agr.* c. 44).

Criticism of internal evidence only wrongs itself by thus slighting the clear testimony of history; especially in the interpretation of a book, the obscurity of which gives double occasion for modesty and caution.

§ 102. *John's Return to Ephesus, and the Close of his Life.*

With the death of the tyrant, A.D. 96, the apostle, after perhaps a year or more of exile, recovered his freedom. The successor of Domitian, the just and humane Nerva, the first of a series of good emperors, recalled the exiles, according to Dio Cassius, and put an end to the mean business of informers and sycophants. John now returned to Ephesus, into his former field of labour, and presided over the church in Asia till his death.¹ To these closing years of his life belong two characteristic anecdotes, which bear the full impress of truth.²

One is given by Clement of Alexandria, who wrote at the end of the second century. It is an affecting testimony to the tender, devoted faithfulness of the aged pastor. Having returned from Patmos to Ephesus, as Clement relates,³ John visited the surrounding region to appoint bishops and organize churches. In a town not far from Ephesus he met with a youth whose beauty and ardour at once so engaged his interest, that he handed him over to the bishop as an object of very special care. The bishop instructed him in the Gospel, and connected him with the church by holy baptism. But the pastor now relaxing his vigilance, the youth, too soon deprived of parental care, fell into bad company, and even became leader of a band of robbers, surpassing all his associates in bloodthirsty violence. Some time afterwards John came again to that town,

¹ Clemens Alex. l. c., and Euseb. III. 20, 23. To his superintendence of the church of Asia Minor may no doubt refer the strange remark of Polycrates in Eusebius (ver. 24), that John wore the petalon, the diadem of the Jewish high priest. Perhaps he was regarded as the Christian high priest, because in the Apocalypse he entered farther than any other into the mysteries of the heavenly sanctuary.

² Other stories, on the contrary, must be referred to the province of fable; as, for instance, that John destroyed the famous temple of Diana (*Nicephorus*, *H. E.* II. 42); and that, shortly before his death, he drank a bowl of poison without harm (first in Augustine's *Soliloquiis*). This last act is ascribed by Papias (in Eus. III. 39) also to Josès Barnabas; and this account may rest on Mark xvi. 18, and Matth. xx. 23.

³ *Quis dives salv.*, ch. 42; and in Eus. III. 23. This beautiful legend has been thrown into a poem by Herder, with the title, "Der gerettete Jüngling."

and anxiously inquired after the young man. "Come," said he to the bishop, "give us back the pledge which I and the Saviour entrusted to thee before the congregation." With a sigh, the bishop answered, "The youth has apostatized and become a robber. Instead of being in the church, he now dwells with his companions in a mountain." With a loud cry the apostle rent his clothes, smote on his head, and exclaimed, "O what a guardian I placed over the soul of my brother!" Taking a horse and a guide, he hurried to the retreat of the robbers. Seized by the guard he made no attempt to escape, but begged to be brought to the leader, who, on recognizing John, fled for shame. The apostle, forgetting his age, pursued him with might and main, crying, "Why fleest thou from me, O child! from me, thy father, an unarmed old man? Pity me, O child! Be not afraid! Thou still hast hope of life. I will account to Christ for thee. I will gladly, if need be, die for thee, as Christ has died for us. Stop! Believe that Christ has sent me." These words were like swords to the soul of the unhappy man. He stopped, threw down his instruments of murder, and began to tremble and weep bitterly. When the aged apostle came up, the youth clasped his knees, prayed with strong lamentation for pardon, and with his tears of repentance, as it were, baptized himself a second time. The apostle assured him that he had obtained forgiveness for him from the Saviour, fell upon his knees and kissed his hand. He then led him back to the congregation, and there prayed earnestly with him and laboured with him, in fasting, and exhorted him, till he was able to return him to the church as an example of thorough conversion.

Another incident, equally touching, is related by Jerome in the course of his exposition of Galatians. In his extreme old age John was too weak to go into the assembly, and had to be carried. Unable to deliver long discourses, he simply said, "Little children, love one another." When asked why he continually repeated this one exhortation, he replied, "Because this is the command of the Lord, and enough is done if this one command be obeyed."—Assuredly so. For as God himself is love, love to Him and to the brethren is the essence and sum of religion and morality, the fulfilling of the law and the prophets, the bond of perfectness.

All the old accounts agree in the statement that John lived down into the reign of the emperor Trajan, who ascended the throne A.D. 98 ; and that he died a natural death in Ephesus at the advanced age of ninety years or upwards.¹ While most of his colleagues were baptized with the bloody baptism of martyrdom, this aged youth passed along in heavenly peace through the tribulations of the primitive church, and softly fell asleep on the bosom of love.² A misunderstanding of the enigmatical language of Jesus, John xxi. 22 : “If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?” gave rise to the rumour that John was not really dead, but only asleep, moving the mound over his grave with his breathing, awaiting the final advent of the Lord.³ His writings certainly perpetuate his life and influence eternally, and the perfect understanding of them seems to have a special connection with the future completion of the church and her preparation to receive her heavenly bridegroom, as they close, in fact, with the significant assurance and prayer (Rev. xxii. 20) ; “Surely I come quickly ; Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.”

§ 103. *Character of John.*

Let us now endeavour to form, from the testimonies of history, and above all from the writings of John, a picture of his genius and religious character. The theoretical and practical talents,

¹ So Irenæus, Eusebius, Jerome, and others. The latter (*De vir. ill.* e. 9) says of John : “Sub Nerva principe redit Ephesum, ibique usque ad Trajanum principem perseverans totas Asiae fundavit rexitque ecclesias, et confectus senio *anno sexagesimo octavo post passionem Domini* (i. e., A.D. 100, as this father places Christ’s death in 32) mortuus juxta eandem urbem sepultus est.”

² When the Ephesian bishop, Polykrates, in Euseb. *H. E.* III. 31, V. 24, calls John a “martyr,” he must refer either to his preaching of the gospel, or (as *διδάσκαλος* immediately follows), to his banishment to Patmos. To reconcile the above tradition with the Lord’s predication respecting the fate of the sons of Zebedee, Matth. xx. 23, Jerome, on this passage, calls to his aid Tertullian’s story of John’s harmless immersion in boiling oil, in which the apostle showed the *disposition* of a martyr, and drank the calix *confessionis*.

³ Augustine mentions this story, but contradicts it in *Tract.* 224 in *Evang. Joann.* According to another legend (in Photius, *Myriobibl. cod.* 229, and in Pseudo-Hippolytus, *De consummatione mundi*, comp. Lampe’s *Comment. in Evang. Jo.* t. i. p. 98) John died, indeed, but was immediately raised again from the grave, translated like Enoch and Elias, and, with these saints of the Old Testament, will appear as the herald of the visible return of Christ, and the antagonist of Antichrist, as John the Baptist prepared the way for the first coming of the Lord.

which the Creator gives man as his dowry, are not destroyed by the action of regenerating grace, but only purged of all admixture of sin, consecrated to the service of God, and thus first brought to full maturity. John is unquestionably one of the highly-gifted natures, endowed with a delicate, contemplative mind, lively feeling, glowing imagination, and a tender, lovely heart. Every talent and trait of character, however, is accompanied by its corresponding sinful tendency, and exposed to a particular abuse. The apostle's contemplative turn, in a bad school, might easily have led him off into the cloudy regions of a false mysticism, or a visionary, pantheistic speculation, which would confound God and the world. But, anointed by faith, which fixed his intuition on the Eternal World incarnate, this gift became a holy wisdom, opening to our view the depths of God's heart, and his purposes of love towards mankind. In his intercourse with the personal Truth, John became the corypheus of Christian philosophers, a representative of divinely-inspired knowledge; pre-eminently the "Theologos." He knew how to communicate in the most simple, childlike dress the profoundest truths, which furnish the maturest thinkers inexhaustible material for study. The symbol, by which the church has represented him, is the eagle, boldly and joyfully soaring into the highest regions; and hence the genial Raphael has represented him as resting on eagle's wings, and looking with intrepid gaze into the heights of heaven. By this significant emblem would the church set forth the keen discernment, the far-reaching prophetic power, the bold flight, and the noble, imposing strength of the mind of John.¹

In his moral character John, like his colleagues, in spite of all his noble virtues, was of course not sinless. Such delicately-formed, loving souls are commonly inclined to sensitiveness, envy, refined self-love, and vanity. A certain jealousy reveals itself in

¹ Jerome (*Comment. ad Matth. Proœm.*) observes: "Quarta aquilae (facies, comp. Ezek. i. 10), Joannem (significat), quia sumtis pennis aquilae et ad altiora festinans de verbo Dei disputat."—An old epigram says of John, "More volans aquilae verbo petit astra Joannes;" and a medieval hymn sings of him:

"Volat avis sine meta,
Quo nec vates nec propheta
Evolavit altius.
Tam implenda, quam impleta,
Numquam vidit tot secreta
Purus homo purius."

his conduct recorded in Luke ix. 49, 50, and Mark ix. 38-40; and his prayer to the Lord for the highest place, a minister's post as it were, in the Messianic kingdom (Mark x. 35), betrays the workings of ambition. Particularly important is the incident related by Luke, chap. ix. 51-56. When the inhabitants of a Samaritan village refused to receive Jesus, the brothers, John and James, broke forth in the angry words: "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Here is plainly a precipitate, carnal zeal, an impure spirit of revenge, which confounded the New Testament position with the Old, and forgot that the Son of Man had come, not to destroy men's lives, but to save them. From this, however, we see, that John by no means had, as is often represented, a weak, sentimental nature. His love was always deep and strong, and might, therefore, easily turn into equally violent hatred; for hatred is inverted love. Probably the surname "sons of thunder," which Jesus gave the sons of Zebedee (Mark iii. 17), has reference to this trait of character, and denotes that intensity of feeling, that vehemence of affection, which might easily vent itself in bursts of anger like that just noticed. An ardent nature passionately grasps the object of its love, but repels with equal violence whatever is hostile to it. So long as this temper was not purified and softened by the divine Spirit, it might, like the heavy, crashing thunder, work destruction. Jesus, therefore, in giving John that surname, rebuked his inconsiderate zeal and carnal passion, and gave him a significant hint to curb his natural disposition, and purge his ardour of all sinful admixtures. But subjected to the discipline and direction of the Holy Ghost, this temper might, like every sanctified natural talent, accomplish great and glorious things in the kingdom of God. In this view, the title, "sons of thunder," implies something honourable. The same thunder, which at one time destroys, at another purifies the air, and with its accompanying showers fructifies the earth.¹ All that was true and good, therefore, in that zeal, remained in the regenerate John; the moral

¹ The Greek fathers are incorrect in referring the appellation *Βοανεργές*, or *υἱὸς βροντῆς* (from *בני* and *רעש*) to the striking presentation of profound ideas, the convincing power of eloquence. Then the title would be *only* honourable, involve no censure, and stand in no sort of connection with the fact, Luke ix. 51-56.

energy, for instance, and decision, with which he loved good and hated evil. The natural disposition was cleansed from all sinful passion, softened, and made subservient to the will of God. In the Apocalypse, the thunder rolls loud and mighty against the enemies of the Lord and His bride. In the Gospel and Epistles, it is true, the gentle, quiet breeze prevails; but here also the storm lowers at least in the distance, in the description of the judgment of the Son of Man (John v. 25–30). With what holy horror does the apostle speak of the traitor, and of the rising rage of the Pharisees against their Messiah! He represents the Lord as calling the Jews, who had murderous designs upon Him, children of the devil, without qualification (viii. 44). He himself terms every one who does not confirm his Christian profession by holy conduct, a liar (1 John i. 6, 8, 10); every one who hates his brother, a murderer (iii. 15); every one who wilfully sins, a child of the devil (iii. 8). How earnestly and decidedly does he warn men of every denier of the incarnation of Christ, as of a liar and Antichrist (ii. 18, *et seq.*; iv. 1, *et seq.*) Nay, in his second epistle, ver. 10 and 11, he forbids even the saluting an errorist or receiving him into the house. In view of these passages, there is nothing at all improbable in the narrative of Irenæus,¹ that when the aged apostle once met the Gnostic errorist, Cerinthus, in a public bath, he immediately left the place, saying, he feared the building might fall to pieces, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, was in it.

If we only do not think of the character of John as unmanly and soft, after the fashion of sentimental romance-writers, we shall have no difficulty in reconciling these apparently conflicting traits of glowing love and consuming wrath, heavenly mildness and thundering zeal.² It was one and the same disposition which revealed itself in both cases, only in opposite directions; at one time embracing the divine, at another repelling the ungodly and

¹ *Adv. Haer.* III. 3. Comp. Euseb. III. 28, and IV. 14.

² We have an interesting psychological parallel in the church historian, Neander, who has been frequently, and not without reason, compared with John. This divine is well known to have been uncommonly mild, and often to have gone too far in his liberality and lenity towards different and even decidedly erroneous views of Christianity. And yet, against certain phenomena of our age, particularly the philosophy of Hegel and his followers, he showed a repulsive severity and bitterness, and in his private intercourse with his pupils took every opportunity to warn them against the "Molech of modern pantheism."

antichristian ; as the same sun gives light and warmth to the living, and hastens the decay of the dead. He who places Christian love in a good-natured indulgence towards sin, entirely mistakes its true spirit, and only ruins the moral character of him towards whom he shows this false forbearance. The more ardently a mother loves her child, the more carefully will she watch and punish his faults, that he may grow more and more lovely. The more glowing and unreserved a man's love to God, the more decided and inflexible will be his hatred of the devil and of all wickedness.

If we compare John with Peter, we find, that with all their unity of faith and love they exhibit the glorified image of God in very different aspects. Peter is made for outward, practical activity, for organizing and superintending the church ; John, with his pensive, profoundly meditative turn, is fitted for promoting the inward life of knowledge and love in congregations already established. In the Acts of the Apostles we find both at the head of the infant church ; but Peter towers far above John in commanding energy. It is Peter who comes forth as the awakening preacher, the mighty wonder-worker, the pioneer and prince of the apostles. The disciple of love, in mysterious silence, stands modestly at his side, yet imposingly ; for one feels that he bears in his silent soul a whole world of thought, which he will yet in proper time and place reveal. While Peter and Paul had the gifts for planting, John, like Apollos, had the talents for watering. To him the Head of the church committed not the work of founding, but that of finishing. As his Gospel, both in its date and character, presupposes the three others, so his writings in general, to be fully understood, call, with all their child-like simplicity, for a high degree of Christian knowledge. In temperament, Peter is sanguine, with a strong infusion of the choleric ; hence excitable, quick in deciding, imperious, passionate, not always persevering and reliable, because determined by momentary impressions ; a man of the present, ready for immediate speech and action. John is melancholic, therefore, not so quickly but all the more deeply moved, clinging with the strongest affection to the object of his love, little concerned about the world without, lingering musingly in the past, a master in knowledge and love. Both disciples loved the Lord with all the

heart, but, as Grotius finely remarks, Peter was more a friend of *Christ* (φιλόχριστος), John of *Jesus* (φιλοῖησοῦς); that is, the one revered and loved the Saviour chiefly in His official, Messianic character; the other was attached most of all to His person, and was, therefore, personally still nearer to Him, being, so to speak, His bosom friend. Then again, the love of the former was more active and masculine, that of the latter more receptive and virgin-like. Peter took greatest delight in acting out his love to the Lord; John, in having himself loved by Him, and in the consciousness that he was so loved. Hence he so often styles himself the disciple whom Jesus loved. Among the female characters of the New Testament, we find precisely the same relation between the practical Martha, careful and troubled about many things, and the contemplative Mary, forgetting the outward world and joyfully reposing in the love of Jesus, the one thing needful. Yet both have the approval of the Lord; both are equally necessary in the kingdom of God; and the absence of either of these characters would essentially mar the complete New Testament picture of the Christian life.

John and Paul have depth of knowledge in common. They are the two apostles who have left us the most complete systems of doctrine. But they know in different ways. Paul, educated in the schools of the Pharisees, is an exceedingly acute thinker and an accomplished dialectician. He sets forth the doctrines of Christianity in a systematic scheme, proceeding from cause to effect, from the general to the particular, from premise to conclusion, with logical clearness and precision. He is a representative of genuine *scholasticism* in the best sense of the term. John's knowledge is that of intuition and contemplation. He gazes with his whole soul upon the object before him, surveys all as in one picture, and thus presents the profoundest truths as an eye-witness, not by a course of logical demonstration, but immediately as they lie in reality before him. His knowledge of divine things is the deep insight of love, which ever fixes itself at the centre, and thence surveys all points of the circumference at once. He is the representative of all true *mysticism*. Both these apostles together meet all the demands of the mind thirsting for wisdom; of the keenly-dissecting understanding, as well as the speculative reason, which comprehends what is thus analyzed in its

highest unity ; of mediate reflection as well as immediate intuition. Paul and John, in their two grand systems, have laid the eternal foundations of all true theology and philosophy ; and their writings, now after eighteen centuries of study, are still unfathomed.

Not inaptly has Peter been styled the apostle of hope ; Paul, the apostle of faith ; and John, the apostle of love. The first is the representative of Catholicism ; the second, of Protestantism ; the third, of the ideal church, in which this great antagonism shall resolve itself into perfect harmony.

§ 104. *The Writings of John.*

The labours and influence of John undoubtedly related more or less to all the departments of religious life, even upon government and worship, as we learn from the scattered testimonies of the second and third centuries. But they were mainly concerned with the living knowledge of the holiest mysteries of our faith, especially the incarnation and divinity of Christ. And hence he is called by the Greek fathers the “theologian” by eminence. His writings have very little to do with the outward form, the constitution and usages of the church. On the contrary, they present an inexhaustible mass of ideas, not logically drawn out, but only sketched in a few masterly strokes—a thoroughly original conception and representation of Christianity, from which a peculiar system and school of theology must arise. In them the church, planted by Peter among the Jews, and by Paul among the Gentiles, plunges into the depths of her life, refreshes herself with the blissful contemplation of the theanthropic glory of her heavenly bridegroom, and with holy longing adorns herself to receive him. As we speak of a Petrine and a Pauline period and tendency in the apostolic church, so we may speak also of a Johannean, though it is not so sharply defined. Over the last forty years of the first century, which comprise the peculiar labours of this apostle and the composition of his writings, there hangs a mysterious veil. It is with them as with those forty days between the resurrection and ascension, when the Lord hovered, as it were, between earth and heaven ; was near his people, yet far away ; discernible by the senses, yet, like a departed spirit, able to enter a room where the doors were

shut; ate and drank with His disciples, yet no longer needed earthly food. The Johannean period, which may be dated from the death of the two other leading apostles, that is, from the Neronian persecution, A.D. 64, presupposes the activity of Peter and Paul, brings together the results of their labours in a higher unity, and forms the transition to the next age, in which the church is left more to herself to develop the contents of revelation according to the laws of human nature. The theology of the second and third centuries does not work much with Paul's doctrines of sin and grace, of faith and justification. The fathers, on the contrary, and the Catholic church, except the school of Augustine, leave these so far in the back-ground as finally to call for the Reformation. The age after the apostles, and the whole Greek church starts rather from John's fundamental ideas of the incarnation of the Logos and the divine human nature of the Redeemer, using them as its weapons against the Gnostic errors, which afterwards grew into formal systems and overspread all Christendom. Irenæus and other church fathers supposed that John himself wrote against the Judaizing Gnostics and Docetists, particularly Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans (comp. Rev. ii. 6, 15). In his Gospel we observe no certain, direct marks of this, except perhaps in the introduction. For much that has been referred to a polemical design, such passages, for instance, as xix. 34; xx. 20, 27, may be satisfactorily explained otherwise. Unquestionably, however, is the fourth Gospel a most effectual, indirect and positive refutation of all the fundamental heresies in Christology, whether springing from Judaism or heathenism; for it unfolds the infallible truth and the objective reality of the theanthropic life of Jesus Christ. In John's epistles we cannot mistake also a direct reference to the Gnostic Docetists who denied, or resolved into a mere appearance, the central mystery of Christianity, the Incarnation, the real abiding union of Deity and humanity in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Cerinthus, for example, affirmed that the divine element, or the Messiah, first united itself outwardly with the man Jesus at His baptism in the Jordan, and forsook Him again at the beginning of His passion. By this theory, he virtually annulled the mediatorship of Jesus, the reality of the atonement, and the whole objective historical character of Christianity. This is the Antichrist, then

already present in many forms, against which the apostle so earnestly warns his flock.¹ But of this heresy, and of the doctrinal contents of John's writings in general, we must speak more at large under the head of theology. Here we have to do properly only with the outward relations, the historical framework, of the books in question.

§ 105. *The Gospel of John.*

This most vivid and profound picture of the incarnate Son of God and His eternal glory as it beamed from the servant form, full of grace and truth, is, according to Irenæus and other church fathers,² the last of all the Gospels, and was written at Ephesus; and this statement is confirmed by internal evidence. For the narrative of John implies the existence of the first three Gospels; explains localities in Palestine, and Hebrew expressions and customs for Gentile-Christian readers; and stands at the summit of the development of the apostolic church and theology. All this points with tolerable certainty to the last thirty years of the first century. But here we shall perhaps be obliged to stop. For the marks which have been used to fix the date more accurately, do not furnish a demonstration.³

The design of the fourth Gospel, as expressly stated by the author, is to lead its readers to faith in the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus, and thereby to the possession of eternal life.

¹ 1 John ii. 18, 19, 22, 23; iv. 3. 2 John, 7, *et seq.*

² Iren. *Adv. Haer.* III. 1. Clemens Alex. in Eus. VI. 14. Eusebius himself, III. 24. Jerome, *De vir. ill.* c. 9, etc.

³ Thus some commentators on John v. 2, where the sheep-gate and the pool of Bethesda are spoken of as still existing (ἔστι), have inferred that this Gospel must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. But aside from the facts that the pool was still pointed out in the time of Eusebius, and that there may very well have remained some ruins of the gate, the use of the present tense in historical narrative is sufficiently accounted for by the effort after vivid representation. Still less does the prophecy of the martyrdom of Peter xxi. 19, imply that this apostle was still living; while the succeeding verses, 20-23, point rather to a later time. On the other hand, from such passages as xi. 18; xviii. 1; xix. 41, where the evangelist speaks of localities about Jerusalem in the past (ἦν), some have drawn the conclusion that he wrote this book *after* the year 70; but such a "was" does not necessarily imply that the thing no longer is. The latest limit seems to us to be the date of the Apocalypse (95 or 96), not indeed because, as almost all expositors down to Bengel suppose, the Apocalypse, ch. i. 2, refers to the written Gospel, but because the whole economy of the Holy Scriptures seems to require, that the Revelation, the seal of the apostolic literature, should be composed last.

The church fathers attributed to it also other secondary objects, such as the refutation of the Gnostics and Ebionites (which, however, is not immediately and clearly apparent), and the furnishing of a supplement to the synoptical Gospels. John certainly leaves unnoticed many very important sections of the history which he might presume were already familiar from oral tradition and the other Gospels; as, for instance, the childhood of Jesus; His baptism, to which, however, he alludes in chap. i. 33, *et seq.*; His temptation and transfiguration; the healing of the demoniacs; the sermon on the mount, and the popular parables respecting the kingdom of God; the institution of baptism, the *idea* of which, however, is for the first time set forth in the conversation with Nicodemus on regeneration by water and the Spirit, iii. 1, *et seq.*; the institution of the Lord's Supper, which is merely touched (xiii. 1, *et seq.*), though it affords the only proper explanation of the similitude of the vine, chap. xv., as well as of the mystic language respecting the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ, chap. vi. 51–58; and the ascension, (comp. xx. 17). In place of these, John gives us the two greatest miracles, the turning of water into wine and the raising of Lazarus, along with the most profound discourses of the Saviour, especially His parting address and mediatorial prayer (chap. xiii.–xvii.), not to be found in the three preceding Gospels. We should not regard John, however, as attempting to correct the other evangelists, or merely to furnish a supplement to them. This idea is at once contradicted by his having many points in common with them; as the miraculous feeding of the multitude, and most of the scenes in the history of the passion. His work is all one effusion, and, though it serves as a valuable complement to the other Gospels, is yet a complete whole in itself.

John wrought on a fixed plan, and he shows a certain art, which, without any clear intention on his part, sprang, as it were, instinctively from his peculiar conception of the subject; as nature by her plastic virtue produces the fairest forms to serve as models for the human artist. In the first place, the outward arrangement of the matter of the book is very clear, all the events of the history being made to cluster around the several Jewish feasts. During the public ministry of Jesus there are

mentioned in all at least three, probably (*i.e.* unless the feast of Purim be intended in v. 1), four passovers (ii. 13 ; v. 1 ; vi. 4 ; xi. 55 ; xii. 1 ; xiii. 1), one feast of tabernacles (vii. 2), and one feast of dedication (x. 22) ; thus furnishing data for the length of our Lord's labours as a teacher (about three years). But along with this external arrangement an inward order is also observed, a progressive development of the relation of Jesus to the world and to His disciples. Especially may we trace the gradual increase of the hatred of the unbelieving Jews towards the personal manifestation of the eternal Light and Life down to the final catastrophe, where, however, that hatred must unwittingly and unwillingly serve to glorify the Crucified, and to accomplish the plan of redemption.

The evangelist begins his history with a philosophico-theological prologue (i. 1–18), propounding as his theme the great truth, that Christ, the incarnate Logos, is from the beginning one with God, and the principle of all revelation, of all light and life in humanity. The history itself may be divided into three, or, if we choose to make a separate part of what is in some sense merely a historical introduction, four sections : (a) The *preparation* for the public ministry of Jesus, first by the appearance of John the Baptist (i. 19–36), then by the choice of the first disciples (ver. 37–51), who are favoured at the outset with a foretaste of the intercourse of divine and human powers, of the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. (b) The *public labours* of Jesus in doctrine and miracle, by which He manifests before the world His divine nature and eternal glory, a savour of life unto life to the susceptible, but to the hardened a savour of death unto death (ch. ii. 12). Chapters ii.–iv. are devoted chiefly to the favourable results of the Saviour's ministry on those who were longing for salvation, on His disciples and kindred at the marriage in Cana, on the still timid Nicodemus in Jerusalem, the woman of Samaria, and the inhabitants of Sichem ; chapters v.–x. set forth principally the growing opposition of the unbelieving Jews (*οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*) to Jesus, till it reaches a deadly hatred ; ch. xi. records the raising of Lazarus, which brings to a crisis the faith of the Saviour's friends and the unbelief of his enemies ; then comes the transition to the history of his passion (xii. 1, *et seq.* ; xxiv. *et seq.*), and a recapitulation of

his discourses (xii. 44–50). (c) Jesus in the *private circle of His disciples*, His last supper, His farewell address, His solemn consecration to death, His mediatorial intercession, and His inward glorification (ch. xiii.–xvii). This section is the peculiar ornament of the fourth Gospel, and the inmost sanctuary of the history of Jesus, where the holy sorrow of eternal Love as it addresses itself to the great sacrifice, and the silent breath from the land of peace, so indescribably charm us. (d) The *history of the passion and resurrection*, or the *public glorification* of the Lord, when, as formerly by His words and works, so now by His obedience and sufferings and a creative act of God, He is mightily accredited as the Messiah, the conqueror of sin, death, and hell (ch. xviii.–xx). In his appearances after His resurrection, He gives His disciples a pledge of His perpetual presence with them. In the enthusiastic exclamation of Thomas : “My Lord and my God !” there expresses itself the fullest recognition of the divinity of the risen Saviour ; and to awaken this faith, which believes even without seeing, was the object of the Gospel, with the statement of which it fitly closes (xx. 31). The twenty-first chapter is a subsequent addition, of special importance for the history of Peter, made either by John himself, or by one of his friends and pupils from what was orally handed down by the apostle.

§ 106. *The Epistles of John.*

The epistles of John were undoubtedly written at Ephesus after the Gospel, which is presumed to be known (1 John i. 1, *et seq.*), and in the advanced years of the apostle, though before the date of the Apocalypse. In them the author proves himself truly a faithful pastor, full of the tenderest love and care for the welfare of his “little children.”

The first epistle attests itself at once by the introduction as well as by the striking similarity of thought and style, which is not that of imitation, but of identity of origin, as the work of the author of the fourth Gospel, with which it stands intimately connected as a practical application. It is a circular letter of exhortation and encouragement to the churches of Asia Minor (comp. Rev. ii. and iii.), which were already well versed in the faith, built on the golden foundation of Paul’s doctrine of grace, and therefore not exposed, indeed, to the gross, sensuous errors of

Judaism and heathenism, but perhaps, instead of these, to a refined form of theoretical and practical aberration, more dangerous because united with Christian elements. The object of the epistle is, therefore, not to produce, but to nourish the Christian life, and to warn its readers against moral laxness, against all intermixture of light with darkness, of truth with falsehood, of the love of God with the love of the world, and against the influence of those Gnostic, Docetistic “antichrists” who denied the reality of the incarnation, the true union of Deity and humanity in Jesus Christ; who separated the knowing of Christ from the following of Him, religion from morality; and who probably fostered antinomian licentiousness. Of these errorists John says, that they went out, indeed, from the Christian communion, but never really belonged to it, and by their secession only revealed the opposition which had existed within them from the first (ii. 19). In perfect accordance with his peculiar character, however, he does not enter on any minute, dialectical refutation of them, as the acute, scholastic Paul does in the case of the Judaizers. He only briefly points out their fundamental error with profound discernment and holy horror, and contrasts it with the Christian principle. Here, as in the Gospel, his great object is to set forth the positive truth. The simple, sublime thought of the epistle, which he presents at the very beginning instead of the customary address, and continually enforces under different shapes with childlike earnestness, is the *love of God and of the brethren*, founded on living *faith* in the God-man, whose history is fully given in the Gospel; in other words, the idea of *fellowship* (κοινωνία, i. 3, 7; comp. v. 1, 2),¹ in its twofold aspect: the union of believers with God and His Son Jesus Christ (unio mystica), and the union of believers with one another (communio sanctorum). The latter is rooted in the former, and is its necessary product; the two are the marks of regeneration and adoption, and are inseparable from the keeping of the commandments of God, from a holy walk in the light

¹ This word denotes the inward, eternal nature of the church, of the ἐκκλησία, which latter term John uses only in the third epistle, ver. 6, 9, 10. The temporal form under which the body of Christ is revealed, is left almost entirely out of view by this noblest of mystics. Scattered traditional accounts, however, intimate that he exerted an important influence on the development of the constitution and worship of the church of Asia Minor.

after the example of Christ, as well as from true joy and the possession of the eternal life, which the incarnate Logos has brought into the world, and which He alone can give. These few thoughts, clothed in the simplest words, contain the sum of Christian morality, and describe the inmost essence of piety. In striking accordance with this is the above-mentioned narrative of Jerome about the aged apostle's continual repetition of the exhortation to love. What Herder says of John's writings in general, may be applied with peculiar emphasis to this first epistle: "They are still waters, which run deep; flowing along with the easiest words, but the most profound meaning."

The second and third epistles of this apostle are, like Paul's epistle to Philemon, very short private letters. In the second John congratulates a pious female Christian of Asia Minor, by the name of Cyria, perhaps a deaconess, on the Christian conduct of some of her children; exhorts her to be steadfast in the truth and in love; warns her most earnestly against all contact with the Gnostic errorists attacked in 1 John ii. 18, *et seq.*; iv. 3; and mentions at the close, in apology for his brevity, his expectation of soon visiting her. The third epistle is addressed to one Gaius, probably an officer of a congregation, commending him for his hospitality to the messengers of the faith, and rebuking a certain Diotrephes, otherwise unknown to us, for his ambitious and uncharitable disposition. Perhaps these lines after verse 6 were a letter of recommendation for some Christian brethren.

In these two epistles the author calls himself neither an apostle nor an evangelist,—nor, indeed, does he so style himself anywhere,—but simply "the elder" (ὁ πρεσβύτερος). This must be understood either in the same official sense in which Peter calls himself "co-presbyter" (1 Peter v. 1), or what is more likely, as denoting the apostle's great age (like πρεσβύτης, Philem. v. 9). For John was at that time an old man in years and experience, a real father in Christ, and it is very possible that he was so styled by his affectionate "little children" in Asia Minor.¹ At

¹ At least John is called, by Clement of Alexandria, in the above-quoted anecdote "the old man" (ὁ γέρον); and he addresses the youth, whom he had found again, with the words: Τί με φεύγεις, τέκνον, τὸν σεαυτοῦ πατέρα, τὸν γυμνὸν, τὸν γέροντα. Though this also may be explained as simply antithetical to the youth. More to the point is

any rate it furnishes no sufficient reason for ascribing this epistle to a "presbyter John," distinct from the apostle. Such a person could in no case have possessed such authority as is implied in 2 John x. and 3 John x. Eusebius, it is true, reckons these epistles among the antilegomena, or the disputed books of the canon; but the uncertainty of tradition in this case is sufficiently accounted for by the fact, that these epistles, being small and of a private character, did not come so early to be generally known or much used.¹ They contain no internal marks of spuriousness. Even the author's severity against the errorists, 2 John 10, 11, is by no means inconsistent with the character of John (comp. § 103). On the contrary, the unmistakable resemblance particularly of the second epistle to the first in thought and style, almost to verbal repetition,² is a sufficient argument for the identity of the author.³

§ 107. *The Apocalypse.*

At the close of the Scripture stands, like a mysterious sphynx, the Revelation of John, or rather of Jesus Christ through John, His servant; the prophetic history of the conflicts and conquests of the church; the book of Christian hope and comfort; the pledge of the all-controlling dominion of Christ in the world, till He shall come to take home His longing bride.

That this book was the last of all the productions of the apostles, is indicated by its position at the close, and as the seal of the canon; by the whole character of its contents, which have to do with the future and the end of all things; and by the oldest and most reliable tradition, which places the banishment to Patmos and the seeing of this vision at the close of the reign of Domitian († A.D. 96), therefore in the last years of John's life (comp. § 101).

The place of its composition was undoubtedly Patmos. From the expression: "I *was* in the isle that is called Patmos," i. 9,

the fact that the term *πρεσβύτεροι* often occurs in the Johannean school, especially in the writings of Irenæus, in the sense—the *ancients*, the *fathers*.

¹ Yet Irenæus cites the 2d epistle, ver. 11, as a work of the apostle John (*Adv. Hær.* I. 13, and III. 16); and Clement of Alex. must have known it, since he styles the first epistle of John "the greater" (*Strom.* II. 15).

² Comp. 2 John iv.-vii. with 1 John ii. 7, 8; iv. 2, 3.

³ On this question comp. Lücke's *Commentar. zu den Br. Joh.* p. 329, *et seq.*

many, indeed, have inferred, that John, when he wrote the book, was no longer there, but had returned to Ephesus. This imperfect, however, is to be closely connected with ver. 10, as though it were said: "During my residence in Patmos I was in the Spirit" (*i.e.*, in ecstasy); and the whole is to be referred to the position of a later reader, to which, as in i. 2, the prophet transfers himself. From i. 11, and x. 4, it is evident that the writing immediately accompanied the seeing and the hearing, so that with the revelation itself the book also ended, xxii. 7, 9, 10.

Reserving for subsequent discussion the matter and design of the Apocalypse, we must here attend somewhat minutely to the question of its *genuineness*, which is still one of the most difficult and distracting parts of New Testament criticism and exegesis. Whilst the Gospel and the first epistle of John are raised above all rational doubt, and have only come out approved and purified from the fire of modern criticism to which they have been subjected by a Strauss, a Baur, and a Schwegeler, the apostolical origin and character of the Apocalypse, on the contrary, has been denied even by judicious and believing scholars on grounds both dogmatical and critical.¹ So far, indeed, as external evidence is concerned, this book fares as well as any other, and better than most of the New Testament writings. The tradition in favour of its being the work of the beloved disciple reaches back to Justin Martyr, who wrote some forty years after the death of John, and himself resided in Ephesus. Nay, we may trace it even to Papias, a disciple of the apostles; and Irenæus, the pupil of the bishop Polycarp of Smyrna, one of the seven churches of the Revelation, appeals even for the correctness of his reading and interpretation of the mystical number 666 (Rev. xiii. 18), to

¹ By Luther, for example, who would regard the book as "neither apostolical nor prophetical," because "his mind could not accommodate itself to it;" by Zwingle, who declared, at the disputation in Berne, "From the Apocalypse we will derive no proof, for it is not a canonical book;" and more recently by Schleiermacher, Lücke, Neander, Bleek, and others, who at the same time regard the genuineness of the Gospel as incontrovertible. With the infidel school of Baur, Zeller, and Schwegeler, it is just the reverse. The Apocalypse, on account of its supposed Ebionism, is found altogether characteristic of the Jewish apostle, John (Gal. ii. 9); while, for the absence of it, the Gospel and epistles are denied to him, and placed down in the middle of the second century. Thus, in this case, the "higher criticism" arrives at two entirely opposite results, which is by no means calculated to strengthen our confidence in it, and should make its eulogists more cautious and discreet.

the testimony of those “who had seen John face to face.”¹ It is true, Dionysius of Alexandria, about the middle of the third century, brought about, in the Eastern church, a partial rejection of the apostolic origin and canonical authority of the Apocalypse; not, however, on historical or traditional grounds, but only from dogmatical prejudices, viz., to get rid of a gross, sensuous millenarianism, which it was supposed to favour, and with which the spiritualism of the school of Origen had no sympathy whatever.

Then again, we have an explicit declaration of the author himself, which leaves us no other alternative but to take the book as the work either of the *apostle* John, or of a deliberate, bare-faced impostor. But against the latter, all sound moral and religious feeling revolts. While in the fourth Gospel the author speaks of himself only in the third person and by circumlocution, in the Apocalypse he more than once calls himself expressly “John” (i. 1, 4, 9; xxii. 8), because he here appears as a prophet; and in the Old Testament no anonymous prophecies occur (comp. especially Dan. viii. 1; ix. 2; x. 2). True, he does not directly apply to himself the title of “apostle” or “evangelist,”² but he appears evidently clothed with apostolical authority; in the first place, from the very fact of his being the organ of so momentous and comprehensive a revelation, which, if it be a true revelation, the Lord certainly would not have communicated, especially during the life-time of his favourite disciple, to an inferior person, perhaps one of John’s own presbyters in Ephesus; secondly, from his position as superintendent of the churches of Asia Minor (i. 4), to which none but an apostle could write in such a tone and with such earnestness and seve-

¹ *Adv. Haer.* V. 30. *Euseb.* V. 8. A very full collection of the assertions of tradition on the point in hand may be found in the learned *Einleitung in die Offenbar. Joh.*, by Dr Lücke, § 30, *et seq.*, p. 261-365, 1st ed.; § 34, *et seq.*, p. 516, *et seq.*, of the 2d ed. (1851); and in Hengstenberg’s *Commentar. zur Apok.* vol. ii., Pt. 2, p. 97, *et seq.* Comp. also several solid articles by Hävernick in the “*Ev. Kirchenzeitung*,” 1834, p. 707, *et seq.*, and Guericke’s *Einleitung in’s N. T.* p. 538, *et seq.*

² In the ἐμαρτύρησε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, etc., i. 2, many expositors detect, indeed, a reference to the fourth Gospel, in which case these words would unequivocally declare the identity of the authors of the two books. But the perfect—ἐμαρτύρησι, “*hath borne record*,” may also be referred, as it is by Bengel and Hengstenberg (*Comment.* I. p. 69), to the time of *reading* (comp. ἐγγράφα, Philem. v. 19), and the “word of God,” etc., in view of the explanatory ὅσα εἶδε, to the succeeding visions of the book.

city of rebuke. Any other John, thus writing, would have come into evident conflict with the apostle's unquestionable official relation to these churches, particularly that of Ephesus, and hence would have been obliged, at the outset, at least to introduce himself to them more distinctly, and to enter more minutely into the proof of his divine mission, if such he really had, before he could obtain a hearing or secure himself from ridicule, since even a Paul and a John (3 John 9, 10) had to contend against enemies of the apostolical dignity.¹ By the simple name "John,"

¹ On these grounds we must affirm, that the hypothesis first hinted at by Dionysius of Alexandria, the spiritualistic and anti-chiliastic disciple of the great Origen, and latterly advocated even by such distinguished scholars as Bleek, De Wette (in the earlier editions of his *Einleitung in's N. T.*), Credner, and Neander (who, however, does not give a definite decision), making the Ephesian *presbyter*, *John* (afterwards confounded with the apostle), the probable author of the Apocalypse, contradicts the clearest exegetical evidence; as also Dr Lücke concedes (l. c. p. 239, *et seq.*), and De Wette (in the fourth ed. of his *Einl.* p. 353, though he again expresses himself otherwise in his *Commentar über die Apok.*) Indeed, there is room even to inquire, whether the very existence of this obscure presbyter and mysterious duplicate of the apostle John rests not upon sheer misunderstanding, as Herder suspected (*Offenb. Joh.* p. 206, in the 12th vol. of Herder's *Werke zur Theol.*) We candidly avow that, to us, notwithstanding what Lücke (l. c. p. 396, *et seq.*) and Credner (*Einleit. in's N. T.* i. p. 694, *et seq.*) have said in its favour, this man's existence seems very doubtful. The only proper original testimony for it is, as is well known, an obscure passage of Papias in Euseb. III. 39—"When I met any one, who had been a companion of the elders (*πρεσβυτέροις*), I inquired about the discourses of the elders, what Andrew or what Peter had said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James, or what *John*, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord, what Aristion or the *presbyter* (*ὁ πρεσβύτερος*) *John*, the disciples of the Lord, say." Had we an accurate author to deal with here, it would certainly be most natural to assume, with Eusebius, Lücke, Neander (p. 631), Credner, and others, that there were *two* Johns, both personal disciples of Jesus. But it is very possible that a man like Papias, whom the mild Eusebius calls, in spite of his venerableness, a "weak head," meant in both cases one and the same John, and repeated his name perhaps on account of his peculiarly close contact with him. So Irenæus, at least, seems to have understood him, when he calls Papias a disciple of the *apostle* John (without mentioning any presbyter of that name) and friend of Polycarp (*Adv. Hæer.* V. 33). The arguments for this interpretation are the following: (1) The term "presbyter" is here probably not an official title, but denotes age, including the idea of venerableness, as also Credner supposes (697), and as may be inferred from 2 John 1, and 3 John 1, and from the usage of Irenæus, who applies the same term to his master, Polycarp (*Adv. Hæer.* V. 30), and to the Roman bishops before Soter (V. 24). This being so, we cannot conceive how a contemporary of John, bearing the same name, should be distinguished from the apostle by this standing title, since the apostle himself had attained an unusual age, and was probably even sixty when he came to Asia Minor. (2) Papias in the same passage styles the other apostles also "presbyters," the ancients, the fathers; and on the other hand, calls also Aristion and John (personal) "disciples of the Lord." (3) The evangelist designates himself as "the elder" (2 John 1, and 3 John 1); which leads us to suppose that he was frequently so named by his "little children," as he likes to call his readers in his first epistle. For this reason also it would have been altogether unsuitable, and could only have created

the reader could evidently understand, in this connection, no other than the well-known apostle and evangelist. And this was, in fact, universally the case in the church, as the testimony of the fathers and the titles of the manuscripts show, until the decay of Apocalyptic hopes and the want of deeper understanding in some theologians awakened prejudice against the *contents* of the book.

The doubts respecting the apostolical origin and canonical authority of the Apocalypse, however, do not arise solely from doctrinal prepossessions. There are also considerable *critical* difficulties, which modern science alone has brought fully to light, but which it has also in many instances exaggerated. An impartial comparison of this production with the other works ascribed to John, shows at once a striking difference in matter and form, and seems to leave no alternative but to deny either the Apocalypse or the Gospel and epistles to this apostle. Here, if anywhere in the field of biblical criticism, honest scientific doubt may be to some extent justified. The difference may be reduced to three points: (1) Language and style; the Greek of the Revelation being largely Hebraized, irregular and abrupt, like a wild mountain torrent, while that of the Gospel and epistles, though not without a Hebrew tinge, is much purer, and flows along in lovely

confusion, to denote by this title another John, who lived with the apostle and under him in Ephesus. Credner supposes, indeed, that these two epistles came not from the apostle, but, like the Apocalypse, from the "presbyter John" in question. But it is evident at first sight that these epistles are far more akin, even in their language, to the first epistle, than to the Apocalypse (comp. 2 John 4-7 with 1 John ii. 7, 8; iv. 2, 3. 2 John 9 with 1 John ii. 27; iii. 9, etc.) This is De Wette's reason for considering them genuine. And when Credner supposes that the presbyter afterwards accommodated himself to the apostle's way of thinking and speaking, he makes an entirely arbitrary assumption, which he himself condemns in pronouncing a like change in the apostle "altogether unnatural and inadmissible" (p. 733). (4) The Ephesian bishop, Polycrates, of the second century, in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the Paschal controversy (in Euseb. V. 24), mentions but *one* John, though he there enumerates the *μεγάλα στοιχεῖα* of the Asian church, Philip with his pious daughters, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, most of whom were not so important as the presbyter John must have been, if he were a personal disciple of the Lord and the author of the Apocalypse. We can hardly think that in this connection, where it was his object to present as many authorities as possible for the Asiatic usage respecting the feast, Polycrates would have passed over this John, if he had known anything about him, and if his tomb could have been really pointed out in Ephesus, as the later Dionysius and Jerome intimates. Jerome, however, in speaking of this, expressly observes—"Nonnulli putant, duas memorias *ejusdem Johannis evangelistae* esse" (*De vir. ill.* c. 9); which again makes this whole story doubtful, and destroys its character as a historical testimony in favour of this obscure presbyter.

tranquillity. (2) The psychological temper and the whole tone of the author. The writer of the Apocalypse shows an exceedingly vivid imagination, moving along majestically with the grandest imagery. He breathes a holy anger against the enemies of God. In a word, he is the "son of thunder," calling down fire from heaven (Luke ix. 54-56). The evangelist, on the contrary, reveals in almost every line a mild, serene, contemplative mind, sunk in deep meditation; breathes forth the gentle breath of love and peace, and bespeaks himself the disciple who lay upon the bosom of the All-merciful.¹ (3) The theological stand point; the author in the one case moving apparently amidst the theocratic ideas of the Old Testament prophets and the Jewish Christian sphere of thought; while in the other, starting from the most profound and sublime view of the incarnate Word, he sets forth Christianity in its specific character as an independent, new creation, though, at the same time, the fulfilment and climax of all previous revelations.

Many scholars think this difference sufficiently explained by the simple fact, that the Apocalypse was written some twenty years before the other works of John.² But even had it been written soon after the death of Nero (which, however, as already observed, is manifestly against tradition), still John must have already reached at that time (A.D. 69) at least the age of sixty, and after that period, style, temperament, and religious views do not usually undergo any material change. Nor can it be con-

¹ We have, however, already observed, § 103, that the apostle John shows also extreme severity in his judgment of everything ungodly, and that this hatred of Antichrist is but the reverse of his enthusiastic love for Christ; comp. especially 1 John ii. 4, 9, 18, 22; iii. 8, 15; 2 John 10, 11.

² So says Gieseler, for example, I. 1, p. 127, note 8: "The internal difference in language and thought between the Apocalypse, which John wrote (A.D. 69) while yet essentially a Hebrew and Palestinian Jewish Christian in his views, and the Gospel and epistles, which he composed after a twenty or thirty years' residence among the Greeks, is so necessary a result of circumstances, that suspicion would be awakened if it did not exist." The opinion of Tholuck is the same, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangl. Geschichte*, 2d edit. p. 283. From the rich treasury of his reading he draws such analogies as the vast varietas dictionis Appulejanae; the difference between the Dialogus de Oratoribus and the Annales of Tacitus; between the Leges and the earlier dialogues of Plato; the sermons and the satires of Swift, etc. This catalogue may be easily increased from the history of modern literature. Think, for example, of the immense distance between Schleiermacher's Reden über die Religion and his Dialektik; Hegel's Logik and Ästhetik; the first and second part of Göthe's Faust; Carlyle's Life of Schiller, and his Latter-day pamphlets, etc.

ceived why he should have learned his Greek first in Asia Minor, while this language was so universally known, and was used by James, for instance, with much skill and comparative purity, though he perhaps was never out of Palestine. In fact, the author of the Apocalypse shows himself, as also Lücke concedes,¹ by no means a tyro in Greek, but well versed and ready in his way. The Hebraisms and irregularities are in some cases occasioned by the character of the matter, and evidently designed;² in others they are rhetorical and poetical; while in some instances they belong to the New Testament idiom in general, which rests throughout, and, indeed, in the Gospel of John far more than even in Paul's epistles, on the basis of the Hebrew, as the New Covenant itself rests on the Old.

We must, therefore, cast about for some other explanation to maintain the identity of authors. This we find, on the one hand, in the different *mental state* of the writer, who, in producing the Apocalypse, was not under the influence of the ordinary, reflecting, self-controlling consciousness (*ἐν νοῖ*), but in a spiritual ecstasy (*ἐν πνεύματι*),³ and was, far more than the author of any other New Testament book, a mere passive organ, an amanuensis, so to speak, of the Holy Ghost; and, on the other hand, in the *peculiarity of his subject*, for which the figurative language of Old Testament prophecy, especially of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, was alone fitted; for this sort of literature was wholly foreign to the idiom of the heathen Greek. The task of the prophet is very different, both in matter and form, from that of the historian and letter-writer. The prophet seeks for poetical, rare, antique, solemn, full-toned, strong expressions; the historian for those which are clear, simple, precise, and universally intelligible.

¹ L. c. p. 363, 1st ed., comp. p. 448, *et seq.*, 2d ed.

² This is the case, for example, in the very beginning, i. 4: Ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἔντος καὶ τοῦ ἐρχόμενου; for this is no doubt a circumlocution for the unutterable name Jehovah (comp. Exod. iii. 14), and the participles are used as indeclinable, to express even in the language the unchangeableness and faithfulness of God. Herder emphatically asserted the intentional character of these grammatical irregularities, of which the above is the most harsh and striking, *Commentar zur Apok.* p. 241: "The solecisms are often properly and diligently studied; the construction is often industriously made to deviate from the Greek. The author's soul labours under the burden of the language of the Hebrew prophets. He wishes to say what they say as they say it. He struggles with the language; he breaks with it."

³ Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 14, *et seq.*, and Rev. i. 10.

Thus the style of Isaiah, for instance, when he moves along in mere historical narrative, and when he rises in prophetic flight, is very different. It is in itself not at all impossible for one and the same apostle, at different times, to have occupied the different spheres of authorship, each in its proper style. We have examples, in fact, of versatile geniuses in the literary history of almost all cultivated nations. Thus, therefore, the differences in view must have arisen from the nature of the case, even though John wrote the work in question long after his Gospel.

This, however, is but one aspect of the matter. The difference between the book of Revelation and the other writings of John, has been manifoldly exaggerated. With it all, there appears a striking affinity between them, as well in the simple, elevated style, and in single expressions, as in the tone and ideas of the whole. In proof of this, we have but to refer the attentive reader particularly to the lyric parts of the Apocalypse, the anthems of profound adoration and blissful joy sung by the glorified saints before the throne of the Lamb;¹ to the incomparable picture of the New Jerusalem and the perfected theocracy, where heaven and earth, God and His people, are forever united, and the material universe, spiritualized, is radiant with the divine glory, ch. xxi. and xxii.; to the expression of the deep longing of the bride for the coming of the heavenly bridegroom, with which the seer sinks back from his ecstasy into the sphere of the militant, praying church, xxii. 17, 20. Truly John-like, too, is the elevation of Christianity in the Apocalypse above all Jewish exclusiveness, and the conception of it as a living power, determining and controlling the history of the world from beginning to end; and, above all, the doctrine of the person of Christ, to whom the Apocalypse, like the Gospel, applies the highest epithets, representing Him as the beginning and the end, the fountain of life, the object of divine worship on the part of angels and the whole creation, the Ruler and Judge of the world;² and knowing of no salvation but through His atoning blood.³ Particularly remarkable is the appellation "Logos" (Rev. xix. 13; comp. v. 5), which is used of Christ nowhere else in the New

¹ Rev. iv. 8, *et seq.*; v. 8, *et seq.*; vii. 9, *et seq.*; xiv. 1, *et seq.*; xv. 3, *et seq.*

² Rev. i. 17; ii. 8, 17; iii. 14; xx. 11, *et seq.*; xxi. 6; xxii. 13.

³ Rev. i. 5; v. 9; vii. 14; comp. 1 John i. 7; ii. 2.

Testament, but in the prologue to the Gospel and the beginning of the first epistle of John.¹ No one in the whole circle of apostolical authors, but John, can have written the Apocalypse; not even the evangelist John Mark, whom Hitzig, following out a hypothetical hint of Beza, has declared to be the author, on account of the similarity of language and the partial identity of name. Still less can any one be selected from among the apostolic fathers, to whom this work could be even with the remotest probability attributed. But the author of such a production, which, in a purely esthetic point of view, is one of the sublimest creations of poetry in all ages, and the contents of which have at-

¹ This affinity in form and substance between the Apocalypse and the Gospel and epistles of John, cannot be altogether denied, even by those who refer them to different authors. Neander says (II. p. 628, Note): The Apocalypse "shows the presence of a Johannean type of doctrine, as the epistle to the Hebrews, while it cannot have come from the apostle Paul, betrays the hand of a man who proceeded from the company of this apostle." Köstlin (*Johanneischer Lehrbegriff*, 1843, p. 498): "It is accordingly confirmed from all quarters, that John's system of doctrine is, in great part, a spiritualization(?) of that of the Apocalypse." Schweigler (*Das nachapost. Zeitalter*, II. p. 373, *et seq.*): "Notwithstanding this material(?) difference, the two books have not a few points of resemblance, in language, style, and matter, so as to make one think that the author of the Gospel had read the Apocalypse, and, to give his production a Johannean colouring, had purposely copied from it many expressions and ideas. . . . Different as the Gospel certainly is from the Apocalypse, yet it is related to it, on the other hand, as the fruit to the root, as the close of a process of development to its beginning." Dr Lücke endeavours to account for this resemblance, which accompanies the (in his opinion) far greater diversity, by the hypothesis, that a friend and disciple of John, during the latter's life-time, wrote down the substance of the book from the oral communications of the apostle himself respecting the visions revealed to him, adhering as much as possible to his style of language and thought, and putting them into his mouth as by mimicry, so as to have the apostle appear as the author, while he was really the author only mediately and partially (l. c. p. 390, *et seq.* 1st ed.) But this artificial hypothesis is only a shift to get out of the embarrassment, into which any one must fall who will not at the start acknowledge the apostolical authorship of the book. Aside from the fact that this supposition has not the slightest historical testimony to support it, it cannot for a moment be thought that John, who traces the principles of morality to their lowest root, and draws an impassable line between truth and falsehood, would have let such a pious fraud, perpetrated at his side, go uncensured, and would have perfectly concealed his true relation to these most important visions. Gieseler, on the contrary, a rationalistic scholar indeed, but impartial and judicious, justly remarks (*Kirchengesch.* I. 1, § 31, Note 8): "I cannot bring myself to deny the Apocalypse to the apostle John. The author describes himself as the apostle; the oldest witnesses declare him to be. Had the book been falsely ascribed to him some thirty years before his death, he would certainly have disclaimed it, and this disclaimer would have come down to us from the circle of his disciples through Irenæus; but the later rejection of it proceeds only from dogmatical interests." And the assumption, too, of a false ascription of it to the apostle after his death has insurmountable difficulties external and internal, historical and moral, in its way.

tracted and engaged with undiminished fascination the learning of the most learned, and the ingenuity of the most ingenious, could certainly not have remained utterly unknown; he must have been a very prominent actor in history.¹

Finally, as the Apocalypse demands John for its author, so, conversely, the peculiar character of John seems to demand that he should produce an Apocalypse.² We suppose that this book has not come into the canon without the special ordering of Providence, and that it forms the appropriate, indispensable conclusion of the New Testament. We believe, moreover, that the completeness of the Christian system of revelation demands prophecy, the unveiling of the future of the kingdom of God by infallible organs, as certainly as this kingdom has its development on earth through perpetual warfare and victory, and as certainly as the hope of the glorious return of the Lord forms a constituent element of Christian life. And now that disciple who had been favoured in a peculiar degree with the gift of intuition and profound contemplation; who drank in adoring reverence and love at the fountain of the theanthropic life, and was admitted to the special confidence of the Head of the church; who was chosen by the dying Redeemer as the guardian of his bereaved mother, and thus, in some sense, His representative; and who, as the patriarch of the apostolic church, experienced most of its conflicts and sufferings, its victories and hopes; that disciple was best fitted of all the apostles to be the organ of these revelations of the future and the final completion of the church, and to seal her sacred records. The mystic John, the apostle of completion, was by his sanctified natural gifts, as well as by his position and experience, predestinated, so to speak, to unveil the deep foundations of the church's life, and the ultimate issue of her history, so that in the Apocalypse the rejuvenated apostle simply placed

¹ The case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which might be cited here, is not parallel. For, in the first place, the author of that book does not name himself at all; whereas the author of the Revelation designates himself explicitly as John, and appears as overseer of the churches of Asia Minor. And, again, there are men of Paul's school known to us, as Luke, Barnabas, Clement, Apollos, who may well have written the epistle.

² This point has been more fully discussed with poetical freshness and great ingenuity by Dr John Peter Lange, in the attractive article: *Ueber den unauflöselichen Zusammenhang zwischen der Individualität des Apostels Johannes und der Individualität der Apocalypse*, in his "*Vermischte Schriften*," vol. ii. (1841), p. 173-231.

the majestic dome upon the wonderful structure of his Gospel, with the golden inscription of holy longing: "Even so come, Lord Jesus!"

§ 108. *State of the Church in Asia Minor at the close of the Apostolic Period. The Seven Epistles of the Apocalypse.*

We must not take leave of John without giving a sketch of the churches in Asia Minor, to which the Revelation is primarily addressed. The theatre of John's later labours was also the main theatre of the Christian life at the close of the apostolic period. At first the principal seat of Christianity was Jerusalem, then Antioch, thence it moved westward, until in the course of the second century Rome became more and more plainly the centre of ecclesiastical movement at least for the West.

The seven epistles in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse gives us a glimpse of the church in its light and shade towards the end of the first century;—primarily of the church of Asia Minor, but through it also of the church in other lands. These letters are all very much alike in their plan, and present a beautiful order, which has already been very well developed by Bengel. They contain (1) a command of Christ to write to the angel of such and such a church. (2) A designation of Jesus by some imposing title, which generally refers to His majestic appearance (i. 13, *et seq.*), and serves as the basis and warrant of the subsequent promises and threatenings. (3) The address to the angel, or the responsible head of the congregation, be it a single bishop or the college of pastors and teachers. The angels are, at all events, the representatives of the people committed to their charge, and what was said to them, was said at the same time to the churches. This address, or the epistle proper, consists always of (*a*) a short sketch of the present moral condition of the congregation,—both its virtues and defects,—with commendation or censure as the case may be; (*b*) an exhortation either to repentance or to faithfulness and patience, according to the prevailing character of the church addressed; (*c*) a promise to him who overcomes, together with the admonition: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches" (ii. 26–29; iii. 5, *et seq.*; 12, *et*

seq ; 21 *et seq.*), or the same in the reverse order as in the first three epistles (ii. 7, 11, 17). This latter variation divides the seven churches into two groups, one comprising the first three, the other the remaining four, just as the seven seals, the seven trumpets, and the seven vials are divided. The ever-recurring admonition : “ He that hath an ear,” etc., consists of ten words. This is of course no unmeaning play, but an application of the Old Testament system of symbolical numbers, in which three was the symbol of the Godhead ; four of the world or humanity ; the indivisible number seven, the sum of three and four (as also twelve, their product), the symbol of the indissoluble covenant between God and man ; and ten (seven and three), the round number, the symbol of fulness, completion.

As to their moral and religious condition, the churches and the representatives fall, according to the epistles, into three classes :

1. Those which were *predominantly good and pure*, viz., those of Smyrna (ii. 9) and Philadelphia (iii. 8). Hence in the messages to these two churches we find no exhortation to repentance in the strict sense of the word, but only an encouragement to be steadfast, patient, and joyful under suffering. The church of Smyrna, a very ancient, still flourishing commercial city¹ in Ionia, on the bay of Smyrna, perhaps eighteen leagues north of Ephesus, was externally poor and persecuted, and had still greater tribulation in view, but is cheered with the prospect of the crown of life. If the Apocalypse was written, according to the oldest and most reliable tradition, not till the year 95, there is nothing against the old opinion that the venerable martyr Polycarp was already at the head of this church.² Philadelphia, a city built by king Attalus Philadelphus, and named after him

¹ Smyrna, or Izmir, as the Turks call it, has at present some 130,000 inhabitants, of whom more than 20,000 are Greek and Armenian Christians. It is also the centre of the Roman Catholic and Protestant missionary operations in Asia Minor.

² This opinion has recently been revived by Hengstenberg (*Comment.* I. 168), and defended against De Wette and others, who date the composition of the Apocalypse as early as the year 68. When Polycarp suffered martyrdom, A.D. 161 (according to others 167), he had already, as he said, served his divine Lord and Master eighty-six years, and would the less forsake Him now. In 107, Ignatius met him in Smyrna as bishop ; and, according to Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.* III. 3, and in *Euseb.* IV. 14), Tertullian and other old witnesses, he was appointed bishop of this church by the apostles, particularly by John.

(now Ala-Schär), in the province of Lydia, a rich wine region, but subject to earthquakes, was the seat of a church likewise poor and small outwardly, but very faithful and spiritually flourishing ;—a church which was to have all the tribulations and hostility it met with on earth abundantly rewarded in heaven.

2. Those which were in a *predominantly evil and critical condition*, viz., the churches of Sardis (iii. 2) and Laodicea (iii. 15). Here accordingly we find severe censure and earnest exhortation to repentance. The church at Sardis, till the time of Croesus, the flourishing capital of the Lydian empire, but now a miserable hamlet of shepherds, had indeed the name and outward form of Christianity, but not its inward power of faith and life. Hence it was on the brink of spiritual death. Yet the epistle, iii. 4, *et seq.*, distinguishes from the corrupt mass a few souls which had kept their walk undefiled, without, however, breaking away from the congregation as separatists, and in modern style setting up an opposition sect for themselves. The church of Laodicea, a wealthy commercial city of Phrygia, not far from Colosse and Hierapolis (Col. ii. 1 ; iv. 13, 15), where now stands only a desolate village by the name of Eski-Hissar, proudly fancied itself spiritually rich and faultless, but was in truth poor and blind and naked, and in that most dangerous state of indifference and lukewarmness from which it is more difficult to return to the former decision and ardour, than it was to pass at first from the natural coldness to faith. Hence the fearful threatening : “I will spue thee out of my mouth.” (Lukewarm water produces vomiting). Yet even the Laodiceans are not driven to despair. The Lord, in love, knocks at their door and promises them, on condition of thorough repentance, a part in the marriage supper of the Lamb (iii. 20, *et seq.*)

3. Those of a *mixed* character, viz., the churches of Ephesus (ii. 2–4, 6), Pergamos (13–15, and Thyatira (19). In these cases commendation and censure, promise and threatening are united. Ephesus, then the metropolis of the Asian church, already sufficiently familiar to us from the history of Paul, and as the residence of John, had withstood, indeed, the Gnostic errorists predicted by Paul (Acts xx. 29), and faithfully maintained the purity of the doctrine delivered to it ; but it had lost the ardour of its first love, and it is, therefore, earnestly exhorted

to repent. It thus represents to us that state of dead, petrified orthodoxy, into which various churches oftentimes fall. Zeal for pure doctrine, is, indeed, of the highest importance, but worthless without living piety and active love. The epistle to the angel of the church of Ephesus is peculiarly applicable to the later Greek church as a whole.—Pergamos in Mysia, the northernmost of these seven cities, formerly the residence of the kings of Asia of the Attalian dynasty, and renowned for its large library,—now Bergamo, a little Turkish village of about two thousand inhabitants,—was the seat of a church, which, under trying circumstances had shown great fidelity, but tolerated in her bosom those who held dangerous Gnostic errors. For this want of rigid discipline, she also is called on to repent. The church of Thyatira, a flourishing manufacturing and commercial city in Lydia, on the site of which now stands a considerable town called Ak-Hissar, was very favourably distinguished for self-denying, active love and patience, but was likewise too indulgent towards errors which corrupted Christianity with heathen principles and practices. The last two churches, especially that of Thyatira, form thus the exact counterpart to that of Ephesus, and are the representatives of a zealous practical piety in union with theoretical latitudinarianism. As doctrine always has more or less influence on practice, this also is a dangerous state. That church alone is truly sound and flourishing in which pure doctrine and pure life, faith and love, theoretical orthodoxy and practical piety, are harmoniously united and promote one another.

With good reason have pious theologians in all ages regarded these seven churches of Asia Minor as a miniature of the whole Christian church. “There is no condition, good, bad, or mixed, of which these epistles do not present a sample, and for which they do not give suitable and wholesome direction.” Here, as everywhere, the word of God and the history of the apostolic church evince their applicability to all times and circumstances, and their inexhaustible fulness of instruction, warning, and encouragement for all states and stages of religious life.

SECOND BOOK.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE MORAL RELATIONS.

§ 109. *The New Creation.*

IF we apply to Christianity the maxim: "By their fruits ye shall know them," if we judge of its origin and character by its moral effects, we find it not only the purest and best of all religions, but absolutely the only true and perfect religion. It alone makes genuine morality possible, and brings it to perfection. The pagan religions embosom a great mass of immoral principles and practices, and even sanction them by their opinions concerning the gods, in whom we find the concentrated essence of all human passions. We discover, indeed, in Confucius, Socrates, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, Marcus Aurelius, and other ancient sages, a multitude of most beautiful precepts and most exalted moral maxims. But they have neither improved the world nor saved a single sinner. They are isolated flashes of light, which cannot make day. They lack an all-pervading principle; they lack unity, completeness, and vital energy.¹

¹ Cicero, in his *Tusculan Questions*, II. 22, where he discusses virtue in only one of its aspects, as the overcoming of pain, in which very aspect, however, the heroic Roman character is most worthy of admiration, makes the remarkable concession, that he has never yet seen a perfect wise man ("quem adhuc nos quidem vidimus neminem"), and that the philosophers had described merely what he would be, *if there should ever be one* ("qualis futurus sit, si modo aliquando fuerit"). The highest ideal of morality, to which classic antiquity attained, was that just man (δικαιος), proving

Action is the most powerful preaching. Life alone can kindle life. On far higher ground stands Judaism, which is not the offspring of unaided, erratic fancy and speculation, but a divine revelation, and has constantly in view the glory of God and the holiness of man. Yet it is but the shadow of a future substance,¹ a preparation for Him who has fulfilled the law and the prophets, presented in His life the ideal of holy love, reconciled man with God, and thereby opened the only pure fountain of true virtue. The law demands; the gospel gives. The law shows what is duty; the gospel gives the ability to do it. The one is a mirror of God's holiness; the other, of His love. The former accuses and condemns; the latter justifies and blesses. True, the law too has its promises; but they are conditioned by the fulfilment of its commands, which is possible only by the Spirit of the gospel. Nothing short of supernatural faith in Jesus, the Redeemer, furnishes an effectual remedy for the disease of sin, and brings us into living communion with God and into the element of disinterested love to God and man, in which the essence of true virtue and piety consists. Without regeneration by the Holy Ghost, there can be, in reality, nothing more than mere outward conformity to the requisitions of the law from more or less selfish motives; a legal righteousness, related to Christian morality as the statue to the living man, or as the shadow to the substance.

himself by suffering, whom Plato portrays in the second book of his Republic in contrast with the unjust (*ἀδίκος*), *Politia*, p. 74, *et seq.* ed. Ast. (Opp. vol. iv.), p. 360, E. *et seq.* ed. Bip. While the unjust man, says Plato, assumes the air of justice, in order to carry out his injustice, the just man, on the contrary, is simple and upright, wishing, as Æschylus says, to *be* good, rather than to *appear* good; a man, who "without doing any wrong may assume the appearance of the grossest injustice (*μηδὲν γὰρ ἀδικῶν δόξαν ἔχεται τῆς μεγίστης ἀδικίας*), that he may try his justice in not allowing himself to be shaken by ill report, or anything that springs therefrom, but in remaining constant until death; being regarded, indeed, throughout his life as unjust, while in truth he is just." Nay, Plato predicts to this wise man, as with a presentiment of Christ crucified, that he "shall be scourged, tortured, fettered, deprived of his eyes, and, after having endured all possible sufferings, fastened to a post" (p. 361, E. ed. Bip.) But after all, this description, in the first place, never rises from the sphere of legal justice into that of religion properly so called; and then it is nothing but a mere ideal, an abstraction, without any certainty of ever being realized; an unconscious and significant prophecy, so to speak, of the unpretending suffering virtue in servant form, which appeared four centuries after in Jesus Christ, and was crucified for the salvation of the world.

¹ Col. ii. 17. Heb. x. 1.

Christianity, therefore, is literally a *new moral creation*, not, however, annihilating the old, but delivering its energies from the corruption and bondage of sin, and raising them to perfection. It makes its first appearance in all its fulness and glory in the theanthropic person of JESUS CHRIST, the second Adam, the head and representative of regenerate humanity. To be Reconciler and Redeemer, Christ must incorporate Himself with human nature in all its motions and states. He must pass through all its pains and moral conflicts. He must perfectly overcome, without once for a moment giving way, the temptation to evil from without, which, as it assailed the first Adam, so also must assail Him, for the trial and exercise of His virtue. He had to maintain, in the thickening conflict with the earthly and hellish kingdom of darkness, His obedience to God and His love to man, even to the sacrifice of His own life. In this way He must break the power of sin in its whole compass, and realize in His own person the idea of sinless holiness, the ideal of moral perfection.¹ That he actually did this is testified by the whole gospel history, as well as by the daily experience of all believers, who continually feel the influence of this moral idea upon themselves, and are conscious that that influence proceeds not from their own nature, nor from another man, but from the person of Christ. His sublime moral teaching is but the reflection of His character. His life, as portrayed to us from personal observation by the unlettered evangelists with the artless pencil of the most single-hearted love of truth, and as it has since lain, as the most

¹ The Christology of the church conceives the union of the divine and human natures in the Redeemer as something already accomplished, a finished fact. This is the theological way of viewing it. But with this there is also a historical and ethical view, which coincides in its result with the other, but at the same time forms its necessary complement. This regards the union in its progress, its development, as a perpetually growing *incarnation of God and deification of man*. These two processes condition each other, and are simultaneously completed, since they are one (not identical). Just so far as the divine forms itself in the various stages and conditions of human existence, the latter is deified, and *vice versa*. The descent of the eternal Logos through the Holy Ghost into the womb of the virgin, in whom the religious susceptibility of the whole human family reached its maturity is the beginning—the exaltation of the human nature, thus forever, yet without confusion, united with the Logos, to the right hand of the Father and to a participation in the divine government of the world is the end—of this sacred biography of the second Adam. Only so far as He has *become* what He *is* by a moral and religious process, by the activity of His will, can He be in any proper sense the *pattern* which we are to follow. Comp. Luke ii. 52; Heb. v. 8.

sacred and certain of all realities, at the foundation of the faith of His people, is an uninterrupted communion with God, His heavenly Father; an undisturbed harmony of all the powers of the soul; a perfect dominion of reason over sense, of mind over body, of the consciousness of God over that of self and the world; an ever-victorious struggle against all forms of sin and error; but at the same time an unreserved self-devotion to the welfare of humanity as a whole, irrespective of nation, age, sex, condition, or culture, making its interests His own, bearing, in the deepest sympathy, its moral and physical sufferings, healing its diseases, perfecting and satisfying its susceptibility for the divine;—in a word, it is *one* grand act of the freest and purest love to God and man. In Him piety and morality, absolute devotion to God and absolute devotion to mankind, are but two expressions of the same inward principle, and therefore perfectly reconciled.

Where in the universe is there a being so full of earnestness and mildness, grandeur and humility, hatred of sin and love of sinners; so deeply moved and inspired, yet of such heavenly serenity and calmness; so symmetrical and harmonious; so thoroughly controlled by a sole regard to the glory of God and the salvation of the world; so divine, yet so genuinely human; so sublime and awful, yet so irresistibly attractive,—as *Jesus of Nazareth*? Here is more than the majesty of the starry heavens above us and the moral law within us, which filled even the prosaic philosopher, Kant, with ever-growing admiration and awe. Here is the “holy of holies” of history, which infidelity itself, if it retain the least sense of decency and of the dignity of man, does not venture to violate. Here is the light of the world, which immediately attests its own presence and glory, and sends its rays through all ages and climes. Here is the fresh fountain of life, in which the noblest of our race have bathed and purified themselves, have renewed their youth and been inspired for every great and good work. Here is the soul’s only true point of departure, its only firm centre of repose, on which rests all confidence in the moral nobility and eternal destiny of man, nay, all certitude itself. Here is the only sure refuge of the weary and heavy-laden—and such are all who know themselves—where they find rest and refreshment, and soon learn to exclaim

with Peter: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life!"—"One could bear," says the childlike Claudius, "to be branded and broken on the wheel for the mere idea" (how much more for the living, bodily reality?), "and he must be crazy who can think of mocking and laughing at it. He, who has his heart in the *right* place, lies in the dust, exults, and adores."

By His sinless life, by His free-will offering of himself on the cross in our stead and for our good, and by His triumph over death and the grave, Christ has wrought out a complete atonement and redemption for humanity, and has become the founder and the head of a new moral and religious kingdom, which carries in itself the necessary supernatural power, and is destined to purge the world of all elements of sin and error, and, leaven-like, to pervade, to sanctify, and perfect it. This purifying and developing work of the Redeemer in and through His kingdom is absolute, arriving at nothing short of moral and religious perfection. If, therefore, there are still imperfection, sin, and error in the world, the reason is not in the Redeemer nor in the constitution of His kingdom, but in the perversity of human nature. Every believer must admit, that, if evil still cleaves to him, it is purely his own fault. So far as he lives in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away, and all has become new (2 Cor. v. 17). Again, this work of Christ is absolute and universal in its extent. As it touches all the powers and capacities of the individual, so it extends also to all the proper, divinely-established relations and conditions of human life, resting not till it bring humanity as a whole (not in the numerical, but organic sense) to perfection; till all sciences, arts, states, and social institutions, in happy freedom, serve the Lord; till even the body is glorified, all nature regenerated and transformed into the theatre of the perfect theocracy, the new earth united with the new heavens, and God made all in all. For Christ is not merely "a clergyman or a pastor, but a high-priest and king,"¹ to whom the whole world belongs and must ultimately submit in free and cheerful adoration.

Thus the incarnation of the eternal Word, while it is, on the

¹ Words of Dr R. Rothe in the preface to the first volume of his *Theologische Ethik*. 1845, p. xiii.

one hand, the culminating point of all the previous, preparatory revelations of God, the winding up of the ancient history, is, on the other, the creative beginning of a vast series of operations and influences, which, flowing forth from this central fact and the ever-present energy of its life, run through all centuries and nations, and will end only with the third and last creation. The Old Testament begins with the natural creation ; the New, with the moral, the incarnation ; and with the union of the two, the absolute glorification of Nature in Spirit, of the world in the kingdom of God, the Bible closes.¹

We are now to observe how this transforming power of the Spirit of Christ revealed itself in the apostolic church : first in the personal character of the apostles ; then in the family and the congregation ; and finally, in civil and national life.

§ 110. *The Apostles.*

When we look at the lives and labours of the several apostles, as they have already been presented in detail ; when we consider their humble parentage and education, their unselfish motives and purposes, their gigantic performances in almost total want of outward means, their incalculable influence not only upon their own age, but upon the whole succeeding history of the church and the world,—we are irresistibly overwhelmed with the impression of a power, a purity, and a sublimity, which far transcend the sphere of mere natural will, and before which the greatest heroes of heathendom vanish like shadows. Here we everywhere feel the life-giving breath of a new moral creation, of a regeneration which reaches to the very centre of the human constitution, and which can be produced only by the power of the Holy Ghost. A few fishermen of Galilee, who, as Jews, were accustomed to make so rigid a separation between a holy God and sinful man, and to shrink from any mixture of the two as from horrible idolatry, rise to the intuition of the absolute God-man, and thereby prove that they themselves have become children of God, in whom is reflected that original, sinless life of the Redeemer. They can all say with Paul : “I live ; yet not I (in my old, natural man, in the flesh, a slave of sin and of the

¹ Comp. § 6.

law), but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). Their piety is thus a real indwelling of Christ in their souls by the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of faith, so that He forms the motive power of their whole being, and they think, speak, write and act by Him, in His Spirit, and according to His will.

This union of the apostles with Christ was not, indeed, a pantheistic confusion. They retained their self-consciousness, their personality and individual peculiarities. No true, living unity can be conceived without personal distinction. But neither was this union, on the other hand, a merely moral one, a sympathy of thought, feeling, and aim, like that, perhaps, between a pious Jew and Moses, between a Mohammedan and Mohammed, or between any pupil and his teacher, or other kindred spirits. Next to the unsearchable Trinity, and the relation of the divine and human natures in the Redeemer, it was the deepest, holiest, and most indissoluble union conceivable. It was a literal community of *life*, which extended to the whole man, beginning in the inmost soul, and ending with the resurrection of the body (2 Cor. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 24); a communion of life, which, according to the sublime representation of the Scriptures themselves, has its original in the mystery of the eternal unity of the Only Begotten with the Father (John xvii. 21); its image, in the tenderest and closest unions in the province of nature, the relation of body and soul, members and head, wife and husband, branch and vine.¹ Christ is not only the progenitor of the life of believers, as Adam was the progenitor of our natural existence; He is a "quickening spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45), and, as such, the ever-present and inexhaustible fountain of life. On Him the whole spiritual existence of his people every moment depends, as the branches on the vine, and from Him they are perpetually inspired anew for word and deed. John xiv. 19; xv. 5,—“Without me ye can do nothing.”

¹ Comp. John vi. 51-58; xv. 1-8. Rom. viii. 9-11. 1 Cor. vi. 17; xii. 14-27. Gal. ii. 20, *et seq.* Eph. i. 22, *et seq.*; iv. 15, *et seq.*; v. 22, 23. Col. i. 18, 24; ii. 19; iii. 3, *et seq.*, and many other passages, especially Paul's perpetually recurring phrases, "in the Lord," "in Christ," where the *ἐν* should not be taken instrumentally and confounded with *διὰ*, but as denoting the sphere of life, the element, in which believers move, and in which all their moral relations, their duties as parents and children, husband and wife, masters and servants, rulers and subjects, etc., have their foundation and their significance.

In relation to the Redeemer, therefore, the religious life of the apostles was derived, gushing forth from His fulness, and wholly dependent on Him, yet at the same time truly free. In relation to the church, however, it was original, welling up in uncommon freshness and purity, the most vigorous and unadulterated continuation of the earthly human life of Jesus himself; a life of love, of unconditional devotion to God and to the eternal interests of mankind to the latest breath. A specific distinction between the apostles and ordinary Christians there is not; for the former owed all to the Lord, and the latter enjoy, in the Holy Ghost, through faith, the same immediate access to the Redeemer. But there is an important difference in degree. A Peter, a Paul, and a John are patterns and examples for us, in a far deeper sense and in higher measure than the most enlightened and godly martyrs, church fathers, or reformers.

The mode of transition from the natural to the higher spiritual life varied in the apostles according to their individual peculiarities; for to these God condescends to accommodate Himself in His revelations. Our Lord himself (John iii. 8) compares the operation of the Spirit in regeneration to the wind, primarily to illustrate the mysteriousness of its origin and end, its absolute freedom and independence upon human calculations, and yet, at the same time, the impossibility of denying or resisting its action. But we may legitimately extend the comparison also to the various degrees of force and rapidity with which the Spirit operates. For as the wind at one time blows a hurricane amidst lightning and thunder, uprooting trees, demolishing houses, and wrecking ships—at another rises gradually and almost imperceptibly, as the cool zephyr, playing with delightful freshness on the brow,—so is it also with the Holy Ghost, according as He has to deal with a proud, energetic character, or a modest and gentle one, with a hoary offender or a guileless child. Upon a Paul He descends suddenly and unexpectedly, like a thunder-storm; upon a John He falls like the gentle dew or the mild rays of the vernal sun. Yet even in the first case the transformation ought not to be regarded as altogether abrupt and magical. Even what are called sudden conversions are always inwardly and outwardly prepared, though often in a way not clearly discernible by the subject himself; they never wholly

break the connection with the previous course of life.¹ For regeneration is not the destroying, but the redeeming, the exalting, and the sanctifying of the natural gifts, faculties, and idiosyncracies. Everything purely human Christianity attracts, develops, and perfects. Only sin it inexorably repels; and sin is not a constituent element of human nature, as it originally was, but an accident cleaving to it only from the fall; not nature itself, but a corruption of the nature created by God, and in itself good. Manicheism has always been condemned by the church as an error, leading to the denial of man's capability of redemption, as the opposite extreme of Pelagianism leads to the denial of his need of it.

Accordingly we find in the apostles, in point of fact, their peculiar temperaments and capacities remaining after conversion, but raised from the sphere of nature into that of Spirit, from the service of self and the world to the service of God and His Christ. How much alike are these apostles, yet how great the diversity among them! The church may well be compared to a garden variegated with flowers of every species and clime; to an anthem, in which the highest and deepest tones blend in wonderful harmony; to a body, whose members have each its particular form and function, yet are ruled by the same head, permeated by the same blood, and subservient to the same end, according to the masterly representation of Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 4, *et seq.* In this very diversity of divine endowments must we adore the inexhaustible wisdom and grace of the Lord. The unbiassed contemplation of this unity in diversity, and diversity in unity, should free us from all exclusiveness and bigotry, and raise us to a genuine liberality and catholicity of thought and feeling.

Peter retained the fire of his nature, his quickness of decision in word and deed, his practical talent for governing; but these were purified from vanity and self-conceit, and coupled with true humility. He became more constant and reliable, and thenceforth sought not his own honour, but solely the glory of the Lord and the salvation of souls.² John remained a son of thunder in the boldness and massiveness of his ideas, in his overwhelming

¹ Comp. Neander's fine article—*Die mannigfachen Wege des Herrn in dem Werke der Bekehrung*, in his "*Kleinen Gelegenheitsschriften*." 3d ed., 1829, p. 130, *et seq.*

² Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11; v. 1, *et seq.*; and § 89 above.

zeal against everything ungodly and antichristian, in his keen discrimination between light and darkness, truth and falsehood, the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world, the children of God and the children of the devil. But the inconsiderate vehemence of passion, in which he once rashly proposed to call down fire from heaven, he had laid aside, and had become wholly conformed to the spirit of his Master. In his character there was a rare blending, by no means unaccountable, however, on psychological principles, of the most ardent love with the holiest severity, an almost maidenly tenderness and mildness with the strongest antipathy to everything impure.¹

Of the character of Paul we have the fullest representation in his numerous epistles, and in the Acts of Luke; as, in fact, this apostle laboured more than all the others (1 Cor. xv. 10). In him the transition from the old life to the new was most abrupt, and therefore most striking. Indeed, he calls himself even an abortion (*ἔκτρωμα*, 1 Cor. xv. 8), to denote the violent, irregular mode of his conversion. Yet his great gifts and learned education, which distinguished him above all his colleagues, were made, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, of the most important service to the church. It is he who has given us the only complete, systematic exhibition we have of the doctrines of salvation. Endowed with uncommon depth and acuteness of thought, with indomitable energy and proud independence of will, earnestly and honestly striving withal after moral perfection, but totally blind as to the way of attaining it, and implicated in the sin against the Son of Man (Matt. xii. 32), he stands at first at the head of the zealots for the law of his fathers, sworn to exterminate the followers of the Nazarene. Suppressing the gentle risings of sympathy, not suffering himself to be disconcerted by the sight of the heavenly sufferer, Stephen, he persecutes the Christians, breathes out blasphemies against the Crucified, and hastens to Damascus, with full power from the Sanhedrim, to root out there also, if possible, the dangerous sect. How entirely different his conduct after the wonderful event which transformed the cursing Saul into the praying Paul, the cruel persecutor into the most laborious and efficient advocate

¹ Comp. what we have already said (§ 103) respecting the character of this apostle.

of Christianity ! All those gifts of nature, which have hitherto been dealing destruction in the service of a blind fanaticism, become gifts of the Holy Ghost, and are consecrated to the most faithful service of Christ crucified, whom he thenceforth regards not as an usurper of the Messiahship, but as the true Saviour of the world, and as his highest, his only wisdom and strength. The same energy, decision, and consistency, but coupled with gentleness, meekness, and wisdom ; the same inflexibility of purpose, but no disposition to use violence or unholy means ; the same independence and lordliness, but animated by the most self-denying love, which strives to become all things to all men ; the same, nay, still greater zeal for the glory of God, but cleansed of all impure motives ; the same inexorable rigour, not, however, against erring brethren, but only against sin and all impeachment of the merits of Christ ; the same fire, no longer that of a passionate zealot, but of a mind at rest, considerate and self-possessed ; the same dialectic acumen of a Rabbini of Gamaliel's school, no longer busied, however, with useless subtleties, but employed to vindicate evangelical doctrine and oppose all self-righteousness. In a service of almost thirty years, from his conversion to his martyrdom, Paul shows such nobleness of mind, such deep tenderness of heart, such disinterestedness and fidelity in labouring for the most exalted and holy ends, the spread of the kingdom of God and the salvation of immortal souls, through almost incessant persecution and hardship, derision and anxiety, hunger and thirst, chains and imprisonment ; and notwithstanding the unexampled success of his labours in two quarters of the globe, with all his consciousness of the unassailable height and glory of his calling, he exhibits such unfeigned humility, declaring himself the least of all the apostles, and the chief of sinners, ascribing all his honour and fame to free grace alone, and glorying only in his weakness, in which the power of God is magnified ; —in short, he presents a character so pure and sublime, that he stands forth as a living apology for Christianity of irresistible force to every unprejudiced mind. Indeed, it seems inconceivable that any one, after thoroughly studying such a life, can for a moment doubt the divinity of the Gospel. Of deception and hypocrisy it is here not to be whispered ; nor even of self-delusion and enthusiasm. For Paul, though he was once caught up into

the third heaven, and heard unutterable words, was anything rather than a dreamer and a visionary. He manifests, on the contrary, rare moderation, prudence, and self-control in all the circumstances of his life. In general, we observe in all the apostles an extraordinary combination of the innocence of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent, depth and clearness, fulness of heart and discretion, vivacity and calmness.

The four leading apostles have by many been characterized according to the four *temperaments*, to James being assigned the phlegmatic, to Peter the sanguine, to Paul the choleric, and to John the melancholic, each sanctified by Christianity. This comparison, however, will not hold strictly; at least, the phlegmatic temperament does not accord with the practical activity of James, and the life and power of his epistle. It is better to suppose in all a mixture of temperaments, with the preponderance of one or another, as in every well-proportioned character.¹ James is the most fettered, Paul the most free; the former predominantly legal, the latter thoroughly evangelical. Yet the two coincide remarkably in their common anthropological starting-point, as also in their spiritualized conception of the law and of righteousness.² Peter is the most outwardly active and practical, John the most inwardly active and mystical; yet is the former also profound and spiritual, while the latter shows equal zeal for a holy walk. James preaches chiefly the acting faith; Peter, the confessing; Paul, the justifying; John, the loving and enjoying. It is at bottom, however, the same faith in all, only appearing in life in different forms, which can never be abstractly severed from one another. With James, law is the main idea; with Peter, hope; with Paul, faith; with John, love. But James makes love the sum and soul of the law; John makes love consist in fulfilling the divine commands;

¹ Ullman (*Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, p. 46, 5th ed.) justly observes, that in *Jesus* we can speak of no temperament at all; as this always denotes a certain disproportion in the combination of mental faculties, the preponderance of one class of talents. "In Him we find only the purest *temperamentum* in the old sense of the word, a mixture harmonious throughout, the proper, healthy proportion of all faculties and talents." The same is true of the apostles, only in a less degree, so far as they approach this pattern.

² As Neander especially has finely shown in his article, *Paulus und Jakobus. Die Einheit des evangelischen Geistes in verschiedenen Formen*, printed in his "*Kleinen Gelegenheitsschriften*," p. 1, *et seq.*

while upon the same love Paul pens from experience the most beautiful and sublime eulogy, and in it Peter faithfully followed the Lord, even to the death of the cross. And as to hope, Peter, on his part, sees in Christ the fulfilment of all the Messianic promises, while all the other apostles, John among the rest, who most anticipates the ideal future, agree with him that we are here "saved in hope," that "we walk by faith, not by sight," and that "it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

Thus, therefore, these representatives of the four ground-forms of the Christian life, which are continually repeating themselves in the church, integrate one another, and blend in full-toned harmony, to the praise of the one Redeemer, whose holy and sanctifying Spirit lives in them all, and to the continual instruction, encouragement, and edification of the redeemed, who follow them in the same path and to the same glorious goal!¹

§ 111. *The Family.*

Marriage, that universal, fundamental moral relation, the nursery of the state and the church, is, indeed, as old as humanity itself, and a strictly divine institution (Gen. ii. 18). But under the influence of sin it has degenerated, and Christianity alone restores it to its proper dignity and significance. Our religion places marriage in the most exalted light by representing it as a copy of the relation of Christ to His church, thus giving it a truly holy, we may say, a sacramental character (Eph. v. 22–33).

By this comparison, in the first place, polygamy, which is found more or less not only in all heathen nations (most rarely in the Roman and Germanic), but even amongst the Old Testament patriarchs and kings, and which has the sanction of law with Mohammedans, is forever condemned, and *monogamy* made

¹ Der Schlachtruf, der St *Pauli* Brust entsprungen,
Rief nicht sein Echo auf zu tausend Streiten?
Und welch' ein Friedensecho hat geklungen
Durch tausend Herzen von *Johannis* Saiten!
Wie viele rasche Feuer sind entglommen
Als Widerschein von *Petri* Funkensprühen!
Und sieht man Andre still mit Opfern kommen,
Ist's, weil sie in *Jakobi* Schul' gediehen:—
Ein Satz ist's, der in Variationen
Vom ersten Anfang forttönt durch *Æonen*.

the rule. This form of the conjugal relation was presented in the creation of the first human pair as the normal one; was made the ideal by the Mosaic law; and is the only condition of a true and truly happy marriage. Then again, in this analogy is implied the indissoluble nature of the marriage bond; for the union between Christ and His bride, the church, can never be broken. The husband and the wife are one flesh; and what God has joined together, man must not put asunder (comp. Matth. xix. 3-9; 1 Cor. vii. 10). Increase of immorality always goes hand in hand with the facilitating of divorce.

Again, Christianity alone raises *woman* to her true dignity. It is well known, that in antiquity, even among the highly-cultivated Greeks, woman was generally looked upon as a mere tool of lust, and therefore in the most degraded light. Her education was shamefully neglected; and if she sometimes attained prominence in society, it was wholly in consequence of bodily attraction and the gift of entertaining wit, not for any moral force or purity of character. Even Plato, with all his exalted ideas, knew nothing of the sacredness of monogamy. In his ideal state he allows promiscuous concubinage. And in the ethical works of Aristotle, among many virtues, chastity and mercy, those pillars of genuine morality, are never mentioned. Sophocles, in his pious, childlike, devoted, self-denying sufferer, Antigone, who followed her blind father into exile, and sought in every way to alleviate his misfortunes, reaches out prophetically beyond the domain of heathenism. Antigone is an ideal creation of poetic fancy, realized only in Christian nations. In reverence for the marriage relation the ancient Germans stood highest. They distinguished themselves above all other pagans by their great regard for the female sex, their chastity and conjugal fidelity; and these traits among others especially predisposed them for the gospel. Yet these become most firm and sacred only by being referred to the holiest of all conceivable relations. Christianity does not, indeed, take woman out of her natural sphere of subordination and domestic life, and throw her into the whirl of public activity, from which she instinctively shrinks; but places her in a religious and moral point of view by the side of man, as a joint-heir of the same heavenly inheritance (1 Peter iii. 7); and by doctrine and illustrious example, as in the ever

blessed Virgin, in Salome, Martha and Mary, and Mary Magdalene, it has opened the way for the development of the noblest and loveliest female virtues in all their forms.

Finally, from that fruitful analogy may be derived all the duties of husband and wife to one another, and to their children, as Paul himself presents them in few but comprehensive words in the passage cited above.

1. The relation of the *husband* to the wife is the same as that of Christ to the church. In other words, the husband is even, by virtue of his whole physical and intellectual constitution, the head of the wife, her lord and ruler (Eph. v. 22). He is not, however, to lord it over her ambitiously and arbitrarily, as a despot, but, with the power of love, surrendering himself to her, as a part of his own being, as his other self, making her partaker of all his joys and possessions, patiently and meekly bearing her weaknesses, promoting in every way her temporal, and, above all, her spiritual welfare, and sacrificing himself for her, even to his last breath, as Christ has given His life for the church, is continually purifying and sanctifying her with His blood, and raising her, as a spotless, richly adorned bride, to full participation in His glory and blessedness.¹ This, then, makes the sanctification and moral perfection of the character the highest end of conjugal life, to which the physical object, the propagation of the race, must be subordinate and subservient,²—a view, of which heathendom never dreamed. Of course, however, the devotion of the husband and wife to each other, as well as to the children, ought never to be absolute, or it would degenerate into idolatry. It should not interfere in the least either with the moral duties of public life and occupation, by neglect of which the most ardent conjugal love must only shrink morbidly into itself and wither, or with the demands of love to God, who alone can claim our undivided heart and life. On the contrary, it should favour both. When there is any danger of a conflict

¹ Eph. v. 25-31. Col. iii. 19. 1 Pet. iii. 7.

² Schleiermacher strikingly says (*Predigten*, I. p. 575)—“The higher end of Christian marriage is, that each party may sanctify, and be sanctified by the other;” and Rothe (*Theol. Ethik*. III. p. 670)—“Only in the holiness of self-denying love can the marriage relation be a copy of the relation of Christ to humanity, which He, by His self-devotion, has purchased for His own.”

here, then the command is of force : “ Let them that have wives, be as though they had none ” (1 Cor. vii. 29).

2. The *wife* stands related to the husband, as the church to the Lord ; that is, she is to be subject to him, and to show him all due reverence.¹ But this obedience does not exclude equality of personal and moral dignity.² It should have nothing slavish or bitter about it, no fear nor trembling. It should be free and joyful in, and for the sake of, the Lord (comp. Col. iii. 18). So the church finds her highest honour, delight, and freedom in everywhere following her heavenly bridegroom in the most trustful self-resignation. Pride is contrary to the nature of woman, except so far as it relates to her husband and children, in whom she forgets herself. In this subordinate position, as well as in the maternal care of her children, and the whole field of private, domestic life, she has occasion to exhibit her silent moral elevation, to unfold the noble virtues of modesty, meekness, patience, fidelity, and self-denial, and thereby to adorn her Christian profession, and to integrate the masculine character. Here too, however, the analogy is not perfect. For, while the wife often converts her husband, and always ought at least to exert upon him a softening, refining, elevating, and sanctifying influence, such an influence of the church on Christ, the Perfect, is of course unnecessary and impossible.

3. The relation of *parents* to children corresponds with that of Christ and the church to individual Christians ; the father here again holding the place of Christ, the mother the place of the church. Every new spiritual birth is the result of the creative activity of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Christian church ; and it is the church which, by the faithful administration of the means of grace, under the direction and with the power of the Lord, nourishes, strengthens, and perpetually sustains the new life of her children, and protects it from all disease and degeneracy, till it reach the age of independent manhood in Christ. So should it be, also, in every Christian family. It is the duty primarily of the mother, who is peculiarly fitted for it by nature, to provide for the wants of the infant, and to awaken its slumbering powers to the first stage of their activity ; but

¹ Eph. v. 21, 33. 1 Cor. xi. 7, *et seq.* 1 Tim. ii. 11, *et seq.* 1 Pet. iii. 1, *et seq.*

² Gal. iii. 28. 1 Pet. iii. 7.

this she is to do under the oversight, and supported by the authority, of the father, who is king and priest in the sanctuary of his own house. Both parents are to treat their children, not with severity, but with devoted, self-sacrificing love,¹ and to train them up, not only for useful members of the body politic, but, above all, for citizens of the kingdom of heaven. They are to train them by instruction, and still more by the living power of example; by actually bearing witness of Christianity in their lives, and by the religious consecration of the whole domestic system; ever mindful that God has given them this precious blessing of marriage, and will one day call them to account for their use of it. This sacred duty the apostle enforces in the few words, Eph. vi. 4, “Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;”² that is, as the representatives of the Lord, so that, properly speaking, the Lord himself, by the free agency of the parents, with earnestness and gentleness trains the children for himself, as His own. The apostle is here speaking, indeed, primarily only to fathers, as the responsible agents in the education of the children; but he certainly would not exclude the delicate, noiseless, but none the less important part of the mother, who, by her meekness, patience, and fidelity, happily softens the sternness of the father’s authority (though without the latter she mistrains instead of training); and who, especially where her husband is not a believer, may and should exercise an exceedingly deep, lasting, and salutary influence on the moral and religious character of the children—an influence which Paul himself recognises in the mother and grandmother of Timothy.³

4. The first duty of *children*, as derived from what has now been said, is of course piety, reverential obedience.⁴ This again is not to be slavish, but cheerful, the obedience of unreserved confidence and grateful love. It is also, in the course of nature, the first form of all piety towards God, and reverence for divine

¹ Eph. vi. 4. Col. iii. 21.

² Not “to the Lord,” zum Herrn, as Luther translates it; which alters the sense materially.

³ 2 Tim. i. 5. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 15; v. 10, 14, where the bearing children, *τεκνογονία*, certainly includes educating them. Woman finds her highest dignity and purest happiness, not merely in being a mother, but also in fulfilling all the duties of a mother in the Lord and for His glory. Human life should be propagated only to be educated for the great end of mankind, for virtue and religion.

⁴ Eph. vi. 1-3. Col. iii. 20.

things. For in its parents the child sees the representative of God, the reflection of His majesty and love, nay, we may say God himself, so far as the child is able to comprehend Him. Where this course, which even natural right and the first commandment of the second table point out, is forsaken, there inevitably results wildness, slavery, and curse. Obedience to the divinely-ordained authority of parents forms the only true training for real freedom and manly independence. All those carnal schemes of emancipation, whether relating to women or children, accomplish just the opposite of what they propose, and will have bitterly to repent their subversion of the natural and revealed order of things. It is worthy of remark, that the apostle makes the children of believing parents an organic part of the Christian congregation, in requiring of them obedience "in the Lord;" thus supplying the purest motive for obedience, and at the same time duly restricting it. For, as parental authority is derived from Christ, and is to be exercised for Him, it can only claim obedience where it answers His spirit and will. When, therefore, it commands what is wrong, it comes into manifest conflict with its author, and destroys itself. Then applies our Lord's language, Matth. x. 37, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me."¹ When the children pass out of their minority, they cease to obey, in the strict sense, and enter the relation of friendship; but never should they lose the reverence which is due in fact to old age in general,² and the gratitude which rejoices to render to parents like for like (1 Tim. v. 4, 8), and embalms them, even after their death, in imperishable memory.

5. Even without any express New Testament command,³ it is easy to see that the proper shaping of Christian domestic life, and especially the successful performance of duty as to the religious education of children, require the *family altar*, on which the father, as priest, may daily offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving and intercession. Family worship, with morning and evening prayer, and use of the holy Scriptures, includes also prayer at table. We are not to enjoy God's gifts of nature thoughtlessly

¹ Comp. Matth. viii. 21, 22. Luke ii. 49. John ii. 4. Matth. xii. 46-50.

² 1 Pet. v. 5. 1 Tim. v. 1, 2.

³ Comp., however, Eph. v. 19. Col. iii. 16.

like the beasts of the field, but “with thanksgiving.”¹ In individual cases, however, it is hard to maintain this family worship properly, without the assistance of liturgies and hymn-books. And great watchfulness is necessary, lest it degenerate into soulless mechanism, into an *opus operatum*, or infringe upon the duty of closet prayer, the unseen personal intercourse of the soul with God. But that this danger is not always sufficiently avoided, can be no reason for questioning the duty of family worship itself, or asserting that it is made superfluous by public worship. On the contrary, we shall always find that the two require and promote one another, and that, where the former dies, the latter also decays.² For as marriage continually replenishes the state, and secures its perpetuity, so personal and domestic piety furnishes the church a constant supply of her best material.

Thus, therefore, are all the natural relations of authority and subordination recognised and confirmed by Christianity, and duly regulated, defined, and sanctified by being referred to the Lord and His church; and thus is the whole family life consecrated as a nursery of the purest virtues, as a miniature theocracy, rooted, indeed, in the soil of nature, in the sexual love of individuals, but rising into heaven.

§ 112. *Marriage and Celibacy.*

Christianity, then, as we meet it in the New Testament, recognises in marriage the normal relation, in which the human character fully develops itself and answers its great end,—a relation instituted by God and sanctified by Christ. The depreciation of conjugal life, by an asceticism which cannot rise above its physical and natural basis to the view of its higher moral and religious significance, contradicts the spirit of the Gospel, and is, in reality, of heathen origin.³ In fact, the apostle numbers it

¹ 1 Cor. x. 30, 31. 1 Tim. iv. 3-5.

² There is no doubt that the regular and general attendance upon public worship, by which the English, Scotch, and Americans are so distinguished above other nations, is especially owing to their high regard for family worship.

³ The defective purely sensual conception of marriage among the heathen could produce both great unchastity, polygamy, concubinage, etc., on the one side, and the ascetic contempt of the relation on the other. For wherever moral earnestness was once awakened, instead of sanctifying this relation, it turned with horror from it. In its ideal of a priest, therefore, it usually includes in some form the conception of celibacy. So the ancient Indians, in the remarkable myth given by Creuzer in his *Sym-*

among the doctrines of the evil spirits, which rule the world of idolatry (1 Tim. iv. 1, *et seq.*), that they forbid marriage, as some Gnostic sects and the Manicheans did—looking on the body, which was created by God, and designed for the organ of the Holy Ghost, with its sensual wants, as a part of the intrinsically evil matter, and consequently regarding all contact with it as sinful.

In this point Christ cannot be strictly taken as our pattern; for He was not merely an individual, but at the same time the *universal* man, for whom no suitable consort at all, of equal birth, could be found. The church, the body of regenerate humanity, and it alone (not the individual soul) is His bride; and this relation is assuredly, as already shown, the sacred model of every true marriage.

As to the apostles, we know for a certainty that Peter was married, and took his wife with him on his missionary tours.¹ Tradition affirms the same of Philip, and gives him, as well as

bolik und Mythologie der alten Völker, I. p. 407, 3d ed. After Birmah had formed from his mouth, his arm, his leg, and his foot, the four patriarchs of the four castes, and had given wives to all except the eldest, Brahman, the progenitor of the priests, the latter complained of his solitude; whereupon he received the answer: "He should not be distracted (marriage is thus necessarily distraction), but give himself up to doctrine, prayer, and worship." He persevering, however, in his request, Birmah in anger gave him one *Daintany*, a daughter of the giant family of *Daints*, and from this unequal match sprang the whole sacerdotal caste of the Brahmins. Among the Greeks, the highest priest of the Eleusinian mysteries, the prophet or mystagogue, was forbidden to marry after assuming the office, and if he already had a wife, he must abstain from commerce with her. In the Roman religion the virgin priestesses of Vesta are familiar. The Gnostic and Manichean contempt of marriage springs from pagan views, and rests on a fundamentally wrong conception of matter and body. With the Jews (except the sect of Essenes, whose asceticism, however, was affected by foreign oriental elements) a fruitful marriage stood, as is well known, in high esteem, and passed for a special divine blessing; while celibacy or barrenness was considered a reproach, particularly for women, or a divine visitation of punishment (Gen. xvi. 2-14; xix. 30-36. 1 Sam. i. 6-11. Psalm cxxvii. 3-5; cxxviii. 3-6. Isaiah iv. 1; xlvii. 8, 9. Hos. ix. 14. Luke i. 25, 36). The priests and even the high-priests were, therefore, all married, yet during their term of service in the temple they were required to abstain from cohabitation.—The high estimate of virginity, which came to prevail so early in the Christian church, cannot be derived from Jewish ideas, and certainly as little from heathenism. It arose, no doubt, from ardent enthusiasm for the kingdom of God, which could very easily take up many vitiating elements and influences from the low pagan notion of marriage; especially as the conception of Christian marriage was so seldom fully realized; for this required a long process of civilization.

¹ Matth. viii. 14. Luke iv. 38, where his mother-in-law is mentioned; and 1 Cor. ix. 5—"Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brothers of the Lord, and *Cephas*?"

Peter, children.¹ From 1 Cor. ix. 5 it has been justly inferred, that at least the majority of the apostles and brothers of the Lord (probably sons of Joseph from his former marriage) lived in wedlock.² At all events Paul here excepts none but himself and Barnabas, while claiming the same right of marriage for himself, if he chose to make use of it.³ Yet ancient tradition unanimously represents St John as unmarried.⁴ As to the subordinate officers of the church, the book of Acts mentions four prophesying daughters of the deacon and evangelist, Philip (xxi. 8, 9). In 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6, it is disputed, indeed, whether successive or only simultaneous polygamy, polygamy proper, is forbidden. But, at any rate, the being “the husband of one wife,” which is required of presbyters and deacons, as also the mention of their children and their own households, 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 11, 12; Tit. i. 6, imply that *one* marriage is right for ministers, and, so far from censuring the married state, present

¹ Clement of Alexandria says of these two apostles (*Strom.* III. p. 448) that they begat children; tradition speaks of a daughter of Peter by the name of Petronilla (comp. *Acta Sanct.* 30th May); and Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in the second century, in his letter to the Roman bishop, Victor (in *Euseb. H. E.* III. 31, and V. 24), mentions three daughters of the apostle Philip, of whom the first two died virgins in Hierapolis at an advanced age, and the third lay buried in Ephesus—Φίλιππον τὸν τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς κεκοίμηται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει καὶ δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ, γεγενηκυῖαι παρθένοι· καὶ ἡ ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη, ἥ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀναπαύεται. At the same place (III. 31) Eusebius, on the authority of Proculus, speaks of “four prophesying daughters” of Philip, who were buried with their father in Hierapolis. But here it is plain from his remarks immediately following, that he confounds the apostle Philip with the deacon and evangelist of the same name, who according to Acts xxi. 9, had four prophesying daughters, and when Paul last went to Jerusalem, was labouring in Cæsarea in Palestine.

² The deacon Hilary, A.D. 380, the probable author of the commentary on Paul’s epistles, falsely ascribed to St Ambrose, and hence called *Ambrosiaster*, explicitly remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 2—“*Omnes apostoli, exceptis Joanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt.*”

³ Hence some, though certainly without reason (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8), held that Paul also was a husband or a widower. So Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* c. 4, according to the larger (spurious) recension—Ὁς Πέτρου καὶ Πύλου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων, τῶν γάμοις προσομιλησάντων. So Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* III. 7, ed. Potter.

⁴ Hence he bears the standing title, παρθένος, παρθένιος, *virgo*. Augustine (*De bono conjugali* 21) mentions with respect as the view of many—“A Christo Joannem apostolum propterea plus amatum, quod neque uxorem duxerit, et ab ineunte pueritia castissimus vixerit.” Hence also it is said in the chant for the festival of St John in the Roman church—“Diligebat eum Jesus, quoniam specialis praerogativa castitatis ampliori dilectione fecerat dignum: quia virgo electus ab ipso virgo in aevum permansit. In cruce denique moriturus huic matrem suam virginem virgini commendavit.”

it as the normal state, and as a good school for exercise in the most important duties of life.

But if apostolical Christianity forbids no man marriage, as little does it enjoin it. On the contrary, it presents exceptions from the general rule, and puts celibacy, if it be a voluntary act of self-denial for the kingdom of God, we cannot say, indeed, above the married state, yet very high, and attributes to it in several places a peculiar value.¹ There are men who lack the qualifications for conjugal life, as the capacity to support a wife, individual sexual love, etc.; others, who, by some fault, whether their own or not, cannot fulfil the necessary conditions; others again, who feel called and bound to sacrifice all earthly love to heavenly, and to minister to the latter alone. Hence our Lord in the mysterious passage, Matth. xix. 10-12, without, however, giving His disciples any command, speaks of three kinds of eunuchism, congenital, forced, and voluntary. Of course the latter alone is of any moral worth; voluntary self-denial for the sake of the kingdom of heaven; the willing renunciation of conjugal love and joys, the better to serve the general moral purpose of life. Such, we must suppose, was the course of Paul and Barnabas. For the former was certainly a man of strong natural feelings, of an ardent, passionate temperament, so that the renunciation of marriage was, in his case, an act of self-denial and moral heroism, for which he was strengthened by the assistance of divine grace. He represents it even as a charism, and notices the diversity of gifts in this respect (1 Cor. vii. 7, ἑκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ). Those, on the other hand, who have not the gift, to whom a life of celibacy would be such a perpetual struggle against natural propensities, as would prevent the quiet discharge of duty, he advises to marry (verse 9). Such a celibacy, as cannot attain to the complete subjection of the

¹ Matth. xix. 10-12. 1 Cor. vii. 7, *et seq.*; 25, *et seq.* Rev. xiv. 4. As to the latter passage, it is a question, indeed, whether by the hundred and forty-four thousand “παρθένοι, which were not defiled with women, and which follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth,” are to be understood unmarried persons, or (as Bleek, *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik*, p. 185, and De Wette, *ad loc.*, explain it) those who have kept themselves free from all whoredom and unchastity, and from all contamination with idolatry. The first interpretation answers best to the literal meaning of the words, but has against it the vast number and the fact, that many of the most eminent servants of God under both dispensations, from Abraham to Peter, who certainly belong also among the “first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb,” were not παρθένοι in the strict sense.

the bodily appetite, is assuredly of far less worth than a virtuous marriage, in which also chastity may and should be preserved. To Paul, who spent his life in missionary travel, and was exposed to all possible privations, hardships, and persecutions, the married state, with its temporal cares and all sorts of personal matters of attention, must have seemed rather a hindrance to the fulfilment of his apostolic calling, and the single state, the εὐνουχίζειν ἑαυτὸν διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, more favourable to his activity in the service of the Redeemer (verse 32-35). With him celibacy was actually an elevation above all earthly cares, an entire devotion to the purest love and the holiest interests, an anticipation of the *vita angelica*.¹ And who will deny that such cases repeatedly occur? Who does not know, that the voluntary celibacy of so many self-denying missionaries, especially in times of wild barbarism and dissolution, as at the entrance of the Middle Ages, was in the hand of God a great blessing, in mightily promoting the spread of the gospel among the rude nations and under numberless privations?² Here Christianity deviates from the old Jewish view, in which celibacy was a disgrace and a curse; it can transform this state into a charism and use it for its own ends. Without the acknowledgment of the peculiar value and manifold benefits of this virginity, which grew out of unreserved enthusiasm for Christ and His gospel, it is impossible properly to understand the history of the church, especially before the Reformation.

But in the chapter before us Paul goes yet further. He manifestly gives celibacy the preference, believing that it enables

¹ V. 7, 32. Comp. Matth. xxii. 30. Luke xx. 34-36.

² Comp. Neander's remarks, I. p. 404. Not seldom is celibacy also very favourable to great scientific investigations in the theological as well as the secular field. We may here refer only to two very different men, Dr Neander the historian, and Alexander von Humboldt the naturalist. We cannot help observing here, that the work of home and foreign missions would be in many respects greatly facilitated, and much expense spared, if among us Protestants that moral heroism of self-denial, that voluntary, and, if not perpetual, yet at least temporary εὐνουχισμὸς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (Matth. xix. 12), were more frequent than it unfortunately is. The great zeal with which many young ministers scarcely ordained (often even while students), look around for a wife, as though they had nothing more important to do, is absolutely irreconcilable at least with the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians and with the example of Paul. The excellent Swiss divine, A. Vinet, expresses similar opinions on the relative value of celibacy, as a voluntary service to the kingdom of God, in his *Pastoral Theology*, transl. by Dr Skinner, p. 156, et seq.

a man better to serve the Lord; and he wishes that all might be in this point like himself, and might share with him the happiness of freedom from all earthly cares and undivided devotion to the highest objects and duties of life. His words are too clear to admit of any other interpretation: "He that giveth (a daughter) in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better" (1 Cor. vii. 38). "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife" (verse 32, *et seq.*) "I would that all men were even as myself" (verse 7). Here undeniably that ascetic tendency and relative depreciation of marriage, which we find in almost all the church fathers, even the married ones (as Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa), has some plausible foundation to rest upon. Yet we cannot, without charging Paul with obscurity and inconsistency, understand him as derogating from the holiness and dignity of marriage, which in Eph. v.¹ he himself so decidedly asserts. The apparent contradiction may be solved by the following considerations suggested by the connection of the passage itself.

1. It must be remembered, that in the time of the apostle the education of the female sex and the whole married life were in a very low state; that Christianity had scarcely begun to exert its refining influence upon them; and that the elevation and sanctification of them must in the nature of the case be gradual. In 1 Cor. vii. Paul has in view the relations actually prevailing in a congregation but just gathered from amongst the frivolous heathens of dissolute Corinth, and therefore such a marriage as by no means answers to the Christian principle, or to the ideal sketched by himself in Eph. v. 32. He has his eye upon a union which stands in the way of prayer (verse 5, entangles one in worldly cares, conflicts with the undivided service of the Lord (32-35), and is in general nothing more than a mere check upon debauchery (verses 2, 5, 9), *Κρείσσον γάρ ἐστι γαμῆσαι, ἢ πυρροῦσθαι*). Here firm opposition to corrupt heathenism was the safe and necessary way to the final realization of the true idea of marriage. So the church at first stood hostile to art, on account

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 28; ix. 5. 1 Tim. v. 14. Tit. i. 6, *et seq.*

of its degradation to the service of idolatry and immorality; yet at a later day herself gave birth to the highest creations of architecture, painting, music and poetry.

2. The apostle plainly has in view approaching pressure and persecution, which are certainly heavier on the married than on the single, and furnish strong temptations to unfaithfulness to the Lord from personal considerations. This is evident particularly from verse 26, which speaks of the “present distress;” verse 28, of “trouble in the flesh;” and verse 29–32, of the “shortness of the time,” earnestly exhorting Christians to rise above everything earthly and be ready for the approaching end.¹ The Christians were then expecting the speedy return of the Lord (as in fact He actually came, though not to the *final* judgment, yet to the destruction of Jerusalem), and it appeared doubly advisable to await the catastrophe in a state of the greatest possible independence of worldly cares and connections. That there are, however, at this day, circumstances, in which it would be an indiscretion involving heavy responsibility for certain individuals to marry, can by no means be denied. The advice of the apostle, therefore, has still its force and applicability.

3. All this instruction on the question proposed to him by the Corinthians respecting marriage and celibacy, Paul repeatedly assures us (verses 6, 25, 40), he gives as his own private judgment, as his humble opinion (*γνώμη*), and not as an express command of the Lord (*ἐπιταγή*), who had given him no special, direct revelation on the subject.² Hence, to prescribe laws on this point is to assume more than apostolical authority. The *prohi-*

¹ Möhler is certainly not unbiased, when, in his defence of celibacy (*Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze*, I. p. 197), he denies any such reference to approaching dangers in 1 Cor. vii. The *διὰ τὴν ἐνσταντασάν ἀνάγκην*, ver. 26, he translates—“on account of the (easily) rising natural appetite,” and refers to a passage in *Heroph. de venat.* ch. VII., where *ἀνάγκη* denotes the impetus ad Venerem. But even admitting the philosophical consideration (the passage adduced, by the way, is not about men, but about dogs!), this interpretation gives no good sense at all, because the *ἀνάγκη*, in this sense, exists also in celibacy, nay, is even still stronger in this state (comp. ver. 9); and hence the avoidance of it can be no ground for recommending virginity.

² In this case, therefore, at least the *possibility* of error is admitted, especially as the personal experience of Paul on this point was all on one side—an experience of the advantages of the single life, but not of those of the married. In his thus qualifying his own advice, we must admire his great pastoral wisdom and prudence.

bition of marriage is expressly enumerated by the same apostle among the marks of antichristian error (1 Tim. iv. 3).¹

Our conclusion, therefore, is, that according to the doctrine and practice of the apostles, marriage is duty in general, but under certain circumstances and for certain individuals, celibacy; that the latter may be as great a blessing to the church and to mankind as the former; that the decision, however, in any particular case, whether to marry or not, must rest neither on the person's own will nor on another's, but on a consideration of the person's peculiar gift, and the plain indications of Providence. The great work of the man remains in both cases the same,—to serve the Lord and Him alone. To do this, in whatever way, is neither greater nor less *merit*, but our bounden duty, and should be at the same time our honour and our joy.

§ 113. *Christianity and Slavery.*

To the family in the wide sense belong also *servants* or *domestics*, rendered necessary by the distinction of rich and poor, and by wants which increase with civilization, and which the proper members of the family alone are unable or unwilling themselves to meet. Here Christianity, when it entered into the world, had to encounter a deeply-rooted social evil, which in consequence of the fall had gradually spread over the most cultivated nations of heathendom, and, we may truly say, then held the *greater* part of the human race in a condition of almost beastly degradation.²

Slavery is the robbing an immortal man, created in the image of God, of his free personality, degrading him into an article of merchandise, a mere machine of his owner, and thereby hinder-

¹ Comp. also Harless. *Ethik.* p. 219.

² Attica alone, in the time of Demetrius Phalereus (309 B.C.), according to the statement of Ktesicles, contained 400,000 slaves, with only 21,000 citizens and 10,000 foreign residents. See Böckh: *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, I. p. 39 (p. 35, *et seq.*, of the English translation by Geo. C. Lewis, 2d ed. London, 1842). The slaves were, indeed, counted by the head, like beasts; but even if we quadruple the number of freemen, to make it include women and children, and, with Böckh, suppose the whole population of Attica to have been at most 524,000, the number of slaves would still be almost four times that of freemen. In Sparta Reitmeier (*Ueber den Zustand der Sklaverei in Griechenland*, p. 116) supposes there were even from 600,000 to 800,000 slaves. In Rome it was still worse, slaves being there an article of formal luxury.

ing the development of his intellectual and moral powers, and the attainment of the higher end of his existence. For this heathenism had no remedy. On the contrary, the most distinguished heathens justified this immoral and unnatural state of things by assuming an original and essential distinction between the ruling and the serving classes. The Hindoos believed, that the menial caste of Sudra, upon which the other three castes looked down with contempt, had been guilty before its earthly life of some peculiarly heavy crime, for which this degraded condition was a just punishment; or, according to a somewhat higher view, that it had sprung from the feet of Brahma, while the Brahmins sprang from his head, the soldiers from his shoulders, and the tradesmen from his thighs. The Greeks adopted the view of Homer, that Zeus deprived those whom he “destined for servitude,” “of half their mind;” and to this passage even Plato appeals in the sixth book of the *Laws*, appearing in general to view slavery as a natural and necessary institution.¹ Aristotle speaks much more plainly. He defines² a slave as an ὄργανον ζῶον, a man, who belongs not to himself, but is the property of another. He declares all barbarians to be born slaves, who have no reason at all or only instinctive, and are good for nothing but to obey. Single instances of intelligent, virtuous slaves he would have pronounced exceptions, which prove the rule. The Roman law looked upon them in the same light, subjected them to the arbitrary dominion, passion and lust of the master, yea, gave to the latter, at least down to the time of Emperor Hadrian, the uncontrolled power of life and death over his slaves. With the pagan Germans, also, the equality of the slave with the brute, of the *servus* with the *jumentum*, was current. It was in perfect consistency with such principles, that the slaves were used and abused like beasts, and not seldom even worse. The Spartans had the abominable custom to intoxicate their helots, in order to teach their youth sobriety by such revolting spectacles of drunkenness; and when the slaves became dangerous from their increasing number, they were hunted in the *Crypteia*, as the chase was

¹ So Ritter with many others assert, *Gesch. der Philos.* II. 450. Yet this may be questioned. For the passage in the *Politicus* (p. 309, *a*), to which Ritter appeals, may be more favourably explained, as it is by Möhler, *Gesammelte Schriften und Ansätze*, II. p. 62 and 76.

² *De Republica*, I. c. 1-7.

called. The celebrated Cato Censorius, in whose time the distinction between the two classes had not yet become so strongly marked in Rome as afterwards, worked, indeed, with his slaves, and ate at the same table with them, but mercilessly drove them away when they became weak from age, and were no longer saleable.¹ At a later day slaves became a matter of luxury, like horses and precious stones. Romans of rank owned them by hundreds and thousands, and their wives likewise kept great numbers (sometimes over two hundred) for the most trifling services connected with their endless wardrobes. Half-naked the poor wretches had to stand before their mistress, who was armed with an iron rod to beat them for every mistake. Even for innocent noises, as sneezing or coughing, they were often unmercifully whipped.²

Exceptions there certainly were. Heathendom retained a faint recollection of a golden age, when there was no sin nor slavery. It had feasts in memory of this age, such as the Saturnalia, in which freemen ate with slaves, and even waited on them. Theseus, and the deified Hercules, once himself a slave, were patrons, and the Vestal virgins, the temples, statues and altars of the gods, and the churches of Rome, were refuges of slaves. In the old philosophers too we meet with many excellent precepts, framed, to be sure, not on the higher principles of religion, but only on those of humanity, respecting the kinder treatment of these wretched creatures; especially in Seneca, his letters, and his work on meekness and mildness (*De Clementia*). After he himself had returned from an eight years' exile in Corsica, he laid down the rule in almost the same terms as those of our Lord, Matth. vii. 12, "So live with an inferior, as thou thyself wouldst wish a superior to live with thee."³ But what were the

¹ On this Plutarch, in his biography of Cato, c. 21, passes censure thus: "As if, when no further gain is to be had from them, there were no longer any room for humanity; as if equity were not more comprehensive than justice! Even dogs and other animals men continue to feed, after they cease to bring them gain. The Athenians provided for the mules used in building the Parthenon, till they died, though they were free from all further labour."

² Comp. on this Böttiger's *Sabina oder Morgenscenen in dem Putzzimmer einer reichen Römerin* (1806), Part I. p. 40, *et seq.*, where the proof is given.

³ *Epp.* 47, ad Lucil.: "Sic cum inferiore vivas, quemadmodum tecum superiorem velles vivere. . . . Vive cum servo clementer, comiter quoque et in sermonem admitte, et in consilium, et in convictum," etc. See these and other passages from

fairest precepts of human philanthropy when they were never observed, or at least very rarely, and then not from principle and fear of God, but accidentally only, or from constitutional good nature? They could at best but mitigate the evil in individual cases. They could effect no radical cure of the system. This demanded an entirely different view of the origin and destiny of man, such as Christianity alone has introduced.

Here also the Jews of course stood on much higher ground. Yet among them, too, servants with their posterity were in thralldom, and could be bought and sold. The Patriarchs had two kinds of servants, those "born in the house" and those "bought with money" (Gen. xvii. 12, 13), who are sometimes enumerated with other property, although there is no case recorded that they sold them. The Mosaic law did not abolish servitude, but regulated and in various respects mitigated it by forbidding ill-treatment, by admitting the slaves into the covenant of circumcision and its religious privileges, and by releasing them from their regular labours every Sabbath, at the three annual festivals, also on the new moons, the feast of trumpets and the day of atonement. If they were themselves Jews, they should after six years' service (without wife or children, however), receive freedom if they chose, and a small outfit of cattle and fruits. The year of jubilee made all slaves free, not only those of Israelitish descent, but also the strangers, as it would seem from Lev. xxv. 10, "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto *all the inhabitants* thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return *every man* unto his possession, and every man unto his family." This was a practical declaration that slavery is an abnormal state of society and incompatible with a renovation of the theocracy, when all should be made to feel equally dependent upon God and equally free in Him.¹ The Essenes and Therapeutæ, according to Philo, repudiated all slavery as inconsistent with the native equality of men. Of course the Jews in their wars with the heathen in many cases

Seneca, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and the Saturnalia of Macrobius (which, however, only copies Seneca, often word for word), in Möhler, l. c. p. 75, *et seq.*

¹ Comp. on this subject such passages as Gen. xii. 16; xiv. 14; xvii. 12, 13; xxiv. 35; xxx. 43. Exod. xx. 10; xxi. 2, *et seq.*; xxiii. 17. Lev. xxv. 41-46. Deut. xv. 12, *et seq.*; xxix. 10-12. Jer. xxxiv. 8, *et seq.*; Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, II., p. 358, *et seq.*; and the article "Sklaven" in Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, I., p. 475, *et seq.*

fell into bondage. The community of Jews in Rome consisted mostly of freed men; and at the destruction of Jerusalem, according to the statement of Josephus, no less than ninety-seven thousand were taken captive by the Romans, some of whom were sold at auction, and others transported to the Egyptian mines.

What posture now did Christianity assume towards this horrible degradation of a great, nay, the greater, part of mankind? We here have to admire alike the reformatory principle of Christianity, and her wisdom in applying it. The apostles did not attempt even a sudden political and social abolition, and would have discountenanced any stormy and tumultuous measures to that effect. For, in the first place, the immediate abolition of slavery could never have been effected without a revolution, which would have involved everything in confusion, a radical reconstruction of the whole domestic and social life, with which the system was interwoven.¹ In the next place, a sudden emancipation would not have bettered the condition of the slaves themselves, but rather made it worse; for outward liberation, to work well, must be prepared by moral training for the rational use of freedom, by education to mental manhood; and this can only be done by a gradual process. Paul, on the contrary (1 Cor. vii. 17), lays down the general principle, that Christianity primarily proposes no change in the outward relations, in which God has placed a man by birth, education, or fortune, but teaches him to look at them from a higher point of view, and to infuse into them a new spirit, until in time a suitable change work its own way outward from within. This principle he applies particularly to the case before us. On the one hand he requires Christian masters, not to emancipate their slaves, but for the present only to treat them with Christian love (Eph. vi. 9); and he himself sends back from Rome the runaway, Onesimus, now regenerate, and thus a "beloved brother" in Christ, to his rightful master, Philemon, in Colosse, with the touching direction to receive him as kindly as he would the apostle himself

¹ For the slaves were employed not only in domestic service, but in all sorts of business, grinding, baking, cooking, making clothes, waiting on gentlemen and ladies, carrying letters, attending to agriculture, and the keeping of cattle, working mines, etc. See Böckh: *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, I. p. 40.

(Philem. verses 16, 17). On the other hand he does not exhort or encourage slaves to burst their bonds, but checks all impatient desire for freedom, and exhorts to reverential, single-hearted obedience to masters, be they hard or gentle.¹

Christianity, however, has also provided the only means for delivering man from the inward and most cruel bondage of sin, the bitter root of all wrong social relations, slavery and despotism among the rest, and for the radical cure, therefore, of the evil in question. It confirms, in the first place, the Old Testament doctrine of the original unity of the human race and its descent from a single pair.² Then it asserts the perfect equality of men in the highest, spiritual view, in their relation to Christ, who has redeemed all, even the poorest and meanest, with His blood, and called them to the same glory and blessedness. In Christ all earthly distinctions are inwardly abolished. In Him there is neither Jew nor Greek, *bond* nor *free*, male nor female; all form one ideal person in Him, the common Head (Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11). On the one hand, therefore, the Christian master is a servant of Christ, with whom there is no respect of persons, and he ought always to be conscious of this dependence, and of the responsibility it involves (Eph. vi. 9). On the other, the slave is by faith a freedman of Christ, in the blessed possession of the only true liberty, that of the children of God, and thus, even though remaining in his bonds, he is raised above them; while the richest prince without faith is but a miserable slave of sin and death. Hence the master should look upon his servant as also his brother in Christ, and treat him accordingly (Philem. ver. 16, 17); the servant should obey, not as the slave of man, but for the sake of the Lord. "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." "Servants, obey in all things (of course not in things contrary to the divine commands, for here the injunction ceases to be of force) your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God; and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22. Eph. vi. 5-7. Col. iii. 22. 1 Peter ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 1 (where the *ὑπὸ δουλόν* forbids to think of free servants), Tit. ii. 9.

² Acts xvii. 26. Comp. Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 22, 47.

receive the reward of the (heavenly) inheritance ; for ye serve the Lord Christ.”¹

By this view, the distinction of master and slave is at once inwardly obliterated and deprived of its sting, even where it outwardly remains. Christianity is so spiritual and universal, that it can exert its power in all conditions and relations, and turn, as by magic, even the hut of deepest misery into a heaven of peace and joy. Thus, there are now slaves, who, through their virtue and piety are infinitely freer than their masters, and put them to shame. On the other hand, a true Christian, who comes into possession of slaves by inheritance, will never treat them as slaves in the proper sense, but as free servants, with all love and kindness ; he will seek in every way to promote their moral and religious culture, even if circumstances, for which he is not personally answerable, should make their formal emancipation for the time impracticable. But of course this alone is not enough. All that is inward, must in the end work itself out and fully establish itself as an outward fact in actual life. So Paul expressly says to the slave : “ But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather ” (1 Cor. vii. 21).² Hence the spirit and genius of Christianity, more powerful than any particular command, has in all ages, without any radical noise and revolution, or contempt for historically established legal rights and the principles of equity, urged towards the orderly, constitutional abolition of slavery ; and though it has not even yet everywhere succeeded—in the freest land in the world, in most glaring inconsistency with its fundamental political principles, there are still more than three millions of negro slaves !—yet it will not rest till, by the power of redemption, all the chains which sin has forged shall be broken ; till the personal and eternal dignity of man shall be

¹ Col. iii. 22–iv. 1. Comp. Eph. vi. 5–9.

² In the interpretation of this passage I agree with Calvin, Grotius, and Neander (I. p. 427), who to *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι* supply the words *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ*, most naturally suggested by what immediately precedes. The supplying of *τῇ δουλείᾳ*, preferred by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, reversing the sense, and making the apostle give the preference to servitude, does not suit the verb at all, and is by no means required by the *εἰ καί*, as Meyer and De Wette erroneously assert. The sense of Paul, then, is : Civil bondage is perfectly consistent with Christian freedom, and thy condition should give thee no trouble on this score ; but if, besides the inward freedom of faith, thou mayest also attain the outward, as an additional (*καί*) good—of course, by proper legal means—reject not the opportunity, but rather thankfully use it.

universally acknowledged, and the idea of evangelical freedom and fraternal fellowship perfectly realized.

§ 114. *The Christian Community.*

The grand feature of the social life of the first Christians was that mark of true discipleship (John xiii. 35), brotherly love, rooted in faith and gospel truth; a communion of saints, founded on the *unio mystica*, or vital union with the Saviour, and drawing thence daily and hourly nourishment. The Christians were conscious of being reconciled to God by the same blood, born again of the same seed, sanctified by the same Spirit, destined for the same end. They felt themselves to be members of one body, children of one Father in heaven, partakers of one salvation, heirs of one blessedness; in short, one holy family of God. Hence they mostly called themselves "brethren,"¹ and attested themselves such by the holy kiss,² by acts of mutual service, and by daily *agapæ* or love-feasts in connection with the Lord's Supper. "They continued steadfastly," as Luke briefly and strikingly describes the social life of the primitive Christians, Acts ii. 42, "in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." "The multitude of them that believed, were of one heart and of one soul," iv. 32. Of course this inward unity and equality of the Christians was not inconsistent with, but included, the greatest diversity of gifts and powers. They were, indeed, "one in Christ" (Gal. iii. 28); but the unity was such that no one could accomplish his destiny separate from the rest. They required and completed one another. There was in the whole body a perpetual vital action of giving and receiving (Eph. iv. 16). True, this fraternal harmony in the congregations was in many instances disturbed. In Corinth there were divisions and party strifes. In the churches to which James wrote, the rich indulged in heartless oppression

¹ See Matth. xxiii. 8. Luke xxii. 32. John xxi. 23. Acts i. 16; ix. 17; xvi. 40. Rom. viii. 12; xiv. 10, 13, 15, 21. 1 Cor. vi. 5; vii. 12; viii. 11; xv. 6; xvi. 11. Col. i. 1; iv. 7. Eph. vi. 10, 21. Phil. i. 14; ii. 25. 1 Peter ii. 17. 1 John ii. 9-11; iii. 10, 14, 16; iv. 20, 21. James i. 16; ii. 15; iv. 11, and many other passages, especially in the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's epistles. Other names, which the Christians gave themselves, were "disciples" (of Jesus), "believers," "saints," and subsequently "Christians." Comp. § 61.

² Rom. xvi. 16. 1 Cor. xvi. 20. 2 Cor. xiii. 12. 1 Thess. v. 26. 1 Peter v. 14.

of the poor. In Rome the circumcised and uncircumcised had not yet become perfectly harmonized. And Ephesus soon lost the glow of its first love. But these disturbances were directly opposed to the spirit of Christianity. They proceeded from the selfishness of nature as yet imperfectly subdued or reasserting its power, and from the corrupting influence of false teachers. The apostles everywhere most emphatically condemn them. Among their exhortations those to concord, to self-denying, forbearing love, are peculiarly prominent.¹

While the church was limited to one community in Jerusalem, it went so far in the ardour of its first love, as to abolish even externally the distinction of rich and poor, and establish a community of goods, after the pattern of the common treasury of Jesus and His disciples. Those who owned houses and estates sold their property, in literal fulfilment of Christ's command, Luke xii. 33; Matth. xix. 21, and laid the proceeds at the feet of the apostles as the treasurers of the common fund (Acts ii. 45; iv. 34-37). Luke commends particularly the self-denial of the future companion of Paul, the Cyprian Levite, Joses, distinguished for the gift of prophetic exhortation and consolation (comp. xiii. 1), and hence honoured with the surname Barnabas.² This community of goods, however, was not enforced by law, as in the sect of the Essenes, but left to the free will of individuals, to the inward impulse of love and beneficence. Peter tells Ananias (Acts v. 4) that he might have kept his field, and, even after he had sold it, might have disposed of the money as he chose. And according to Acts xii. 12, Mary, the mother of the evangelist John Mark, and a member of the church, owned a house in Jerusalem. The distribution of alms to widows spoken of in Acts vi. also seems to indicate that the distinction between

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. i. 10, *et seq.*; iii. 3, *et seq.* Gal. v. 15. Rom. xiv.-xvi. Phil. ii. 1-3. James ii. 1, *et seq.*; iii. 13, *et seq.*; iv. 1, *et seq.* 1 John ii. 9, *et seq.*; iii. 11, *et seq.*, etc.

² From **בַּר נְבִיאָה**, properly *υἱὸς προφητείας*, which, however, includes *παράκλησις*, Acts iv. 37. He was in all probability the same as Joseph Barsabas, one of the two candidates for the vacant apostleship, i. 23, although some commentators make them two different persons.—It is true the Mosaic law allotted the priests and Levites only tithes, not real estate, except the forty-eight cities, with their suburbs assigned them in Num. xxxv. 2, *et seq.* But this institution was probably not revived after the Babylonish captivity. Indeed, as early as Jeremiah's time, the priests could purchase pieces of ground (Jer. xxxii. 7).

poor and rich was not altogether done away. It is most probable, however, that at this time most of the believers gave up their property, and that the enthusiasm of their first love did more than the strictest law could have accomplished. In this childlike economy of the primitive Christian community we may see a prophetic anticipation of the state of things in the perfected kingdom of God, where the civil distinction of poverty and wealth will entirely disappear, and all be kings and priests. It is worthy of remark, however, that community of goods in the universal establishment of which visionary reformers expect to find a panacea for society, was not free, even in the primitive apostolic church, from temptation to hypocrisy and avarice; as the examples of Ananias (Acts v. 1, *et seq.*) and of the dissatisfied Hebrew widows (vi. 1) show.

How long the community of goods lasted in Jerusalem we know not. On a larger scale it could not have been carried out without an entire subversion of all existing relations; and from this the apostles were infinitely removed. Hence in other congregations we find no trace of it. But in them all prevailed, no doubt, the disposition which lay at the root of it, the spirit of Christian love and charity. This is the true socialism and communism, which inwardly breaks down the distinction of rich and poor, without abolishing it in the civil sense, or levelling the inequalities and varieties of life according to abstract theories, and which takes the sting from all other forms of aristocracy, such as the inevitable dominion of talent over mental weakness, of culture over ignorance, etc.¹ For Christianity perpetually reminds the rich and powerful of their poverty and weakness before almighty God, and urges them to liberality and humanity; while it makes the poor and weak conscious of their riches and strength in the Lord, and thus raises them above the greatest outward misery. "Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted; but the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away" (James i. 9, 10).

¹ The modern communism is mostly a carnal, in some cases even a diabolical, caricature of the self-denying brotherly love of Christians, and proceeds, not from genuine interest in the lot of the poor, but rather from low envy of the rich, from mean selfishness and infidel radicalism. Yet we would by no means deny that, in opposition to the rigid distinction of classes, and the heartless money aristocracy of modern society, it finds some justification.

Works of mercy, of self-denying care and consolation for the needy and the troubled, were from the first a main ornament of the Christian life (James i. 27). The example of the female disciple, Tabitha, who, with her own hands made clothing for widows and orphans (Acts ix. 36), was certainly not alone in the apostolic church, though the history does not mention many individual cases. Alms and other expressions of Christian benevolence, love solitude and silence, according to our Lord's exhortation: "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth."

§ 115. *Civil and National Life.*

Christ did not appear, it is true, as a political reformer, but as King of truth, and Founder of the kingdom of heaven. He more than once decidedly condemned the earthly Messianic hopes of his contemporaries, and neither in doctrine nor in act did He concern himself directly with political affairs.¹ The same is true of the apostles. They left untouched the Roman civil institutions, in which there was certainly much to censure and to improve; and they never courted in the least the favour of rulers.

But Christianity is not by any means on this account indifferent or hostile to politics. On the contrary, history testifies, that it has indirectly exerted a very important and exceedingly beneficent influence on the development and purification of states, and is indispensable to their perfection. It sees in the body politic not an arbitrary, human invention; in the magistracy, not a mere slavish creature of the sovereign will of the people, but a divine ordinance for the administration of eternal justice, which punishes evil and rewards good; for upholding the majesty of law; for maintaining order and security both of person and of property; and for promoting the public weal (Rom. xiii. 1-5). The state is moral society resting on law; the church, the same resting on the gospel. The one is necessarily limited and national; the other catholic and universal. The former looks to temporal welfare; the latter to eternal. But each promotes and protects the other. The state in a measure trains for the church; as the law is a schoolmaster to bring to

¹ Compare Matth. xxii. 15-22. Luke xii. 13, 14; xxii. 25, 26. John vi. 15; viii. 11; xviii. 36, 37.

Christ. As a legal institution it remains absolutely necessary, until the law become in all men the inward power of love, and outward constraint become needless.

As to the particular form of government for a state, the apostles give no directions. As all power and authority come from God, so also does the power of the civil government,¹ be it an absolute or a limited monarchy or a republic; be it an aristocracy or a democracy. In virtue of its elevation above the temporal and earthly, Christianity may exist under all forms of civil government, and will always favour that which most corresponds to the historical relations and wants of a nation, and which is, therefore, relatively the best. Of course, however, in this point also it tends steadily to improvement and to the highest possible perfection; to the abolition of hurtful laws and institutions, and the introduction of good; to an organization, under which the power is judiciously distributed, the rights of the individual as well as of the commonwealth best preserved, and the moral ends of the race most efficiently promoted and most surely attained. The spirit of the gospel can, therefore, permanently tolerate neither absolute despotism, which checks the free growth of the intellectual and moral powers of the people, and subjects them to the arbitrary will of a mortal, nor the rude dominion of the mob, which shatters the foundations of public order and security, and ends at last in anarchy and barbarism. Between these two extremes there are various forms of government, under which the church may, and actually does thrive. Nay, even oppression and persecution on the part of the reigning secular power may be favourable to her in a moral point of view, as the history of the first three centuries, the classical age of Christian martyrdom, sufficiently shows. But this is certainly not the normal state of things. The least that the church may and must demand of the state, is to be tolerated and to enjoy the protection of the laws.

¹ Rom. xiii. 1. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὖσαι (ἐξουσίαι) ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν. Into the question whether a revolutionary administration, resting on usurpation, is of divine origin and authority, Paul does not here enter. Yet, such a government is certainly not excepted (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 13), and can likewise claim obedience, provided it be actually established by the overthrow of the former regime, and by the oath of allegiance, and accomplish the end of government, the administration of law and justice, verses 3, 4, and 6.

The above conception of the magistrate shows his duty to rule not arbitrarily and despotically, but in the name of God and for the good of his subjects; to maintain right and law, humbly mindful of his heavy responsibility to the supreme power in heaven. For rulers stand not over, but under, the law, and only when they exercise their office as servants of God (Rom. xiii. 4), can they be in the noblest sense also the servants of the people, and promote their true welfare. Tyrants and ambitious demagogues at last ruin both themselves and those they rule. The duty of subjects is obedience. This is enjoined with special emphasis by Paul and Peter¹ on account of the rebellious spirit of the Jews,² which might easily communicate itself to the Jewish Christians, particularly under so tyrannical an administration as that of the emperor Nero. In such cases men are very likely to confound the person with the office, and summarily to repudiate the latter with the former; whereas the office remains divine and sacred, even though the temporary holder of it do the opposite of what it requires.

But of course the apostles did not require a blind, slavish subjection to any man, however high his position. They enjoined subjection "for the Lord's sake," and "for conscience sake."³ Fawning is unchristian and unworthy of a free man. With what dignity and noble self-respect did Christ stand as King of truth before Caiaphas and Pilate! and Paul, as the apostle of the risen Saviour before the Sanhedrim, before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa, and finally before the Roman emperor! Again, the subjection here required is not absolute and unlimited. In obeying the constituted authorities—thus runs the exhortation, Rom. xiii.—a man should, properly speaking, obey God only, whose minister the magistrate is, and whose sword he bears. And hence obedience to an earthly ruler must be measured and limited by the obligation to the heavenly; as is hinted by the significant collocation: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matth. xxii. 21). When, therefore, the temporal authority commands

¹ Rom. xiii. 1. Tit. iii. 1. 1 Peter ii. 13-17.

² Who, on this account, were banished from Rome under Claudius. Comp. Neander: *Apost. Gesch.* I. p. 461, and Tholuck on Rom. xiii. 1 (p. 647).

³ 1 Peter ii. 13. Rom. xiii. 5.

what is contrary to the divine will, irreligious, and immoral, or even when it violates the general rights and honour of the body politic, it comes into conflict with itself and with the law, to which it, as well as the humblest citizen, owes allegiance. It ceases to be God's minister, and loses all claim to regard. It is then the duty of the Christian to refuse to obey, and that in the way of obedience to God, and "for conscience sake," according to Peter's maxim: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts v. 29; comp. iv. 19). The apostles would be forbidden to confess the faith and preach the gospel neither by the Jewish nor the Roman authorities, and preferred imprisonment, exile, and death, to acting against their conscience.¹ Yet in such cases the Christian resorts not to violent measures of resistance and rebellion, which are under any circumstances morally wrong, but to the spiritual weapons of the word, faith, prayer (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 2), and patience. "Though we walk in the flesh," says Paul (2 Cor. x. 3, *et seq.*), "we do not war after the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God." Martyrdom is a far nobler heroism than resistance with fire and sword, and leads in the end to a purer and more lasting victory. Undoubtedly, there are sometimes revolutions,² in which truly pious men engage as members of the body politic, from motives of patriotism and religion,³ and which may be justified, at least

¹ Acts iv. 20; v. 18, 20, *et seq.*; 28, *et seq.*; vii. 2, *et seq.*; xvi. 22; xvii. 6, *et seq.*; xxii.-xxvi. 2 Tim. iv. 17.

² This name, however, is made to comprehend many acts, which have in reality nothing rebellious about them; as, for instance, the involuntary withdrawal of a people, under general indignation, from a worthless administration, which has made itself illegitimate by its own acts; or the voluntary, but orderly emancipation of a colony rife for self-government from the unduly prolonged guardianship of the mother country, which would still treat the adult daughter as a child. To such revolutions, in themselves considered (to which it were better not to apply this name at all), there can of course be no reasonable objection.

³ As in the reformation in Scotland, which was at the same time a political revolution; the struggle for freedom in the Netherlands; the Puritanic revolution under Cromwell, and the North American under Washington. The Reformed theologians, particularly in England and America, are much more liberal than the Lutheran in their opinion of revolutions, and in all their political views. The good and pious Dr Thomas Arnold vindicates even the July revolution in France as a blessed revolution, without a stain, without its parallel in history, and extols it as the most glorious example of the quick and powerful suppression of a royal insurrection against society which the world ever saw. See his letter to Cornish, August 1830. Yet the revolution of February 1848, and the dethronement of Louis Philippe, would probably have led him to modify his judgment considerably.

to some extent, on Christian principles ; that is, so far as the government itself has first trampled upon all law and right, has set itself against the general good, and has spurned all the lawful measures of the people for redress. Such rare cases, however, are to be counted anomalies and necessary evils. They are the last desperate efforts of nations to get rid of irremediable diseases ; thunder storms in the pestilential atmosphere of society ; volcanic eruptions of the natural life of history, which become impossible as fast as the spirit of Christianity works itself into civil and national life. It remains the duty of Christians in the most trying state of political affairs, to bear as long as is at all possible ; to avoid war and bloodshed ; rather to suffer, than to do injustice ; and to confine themselves to moral and spiritual means of resistance, which are generally slower, indeed, but always surer. They should bear in mind that our Lord and His apostles, in the days of a Tiberius, a Caligula, a Claudius, a Nero, and a Domitian, explicitly enjoined obedience ; and that a bad administration may be also the rod of divine chastisement to a nation. Furthermore, very much depends undoubtedly on whether this and that individual are inwardly qualified and outwardly situated for political action ; and here it is impossible to judge all by the same rule. What would be censurable here, or at least unbecoming, in a preacher of the gospel, may be duty for a statesman or a general.

Finally, upon the mutual relations of *nations* also Christianity has exerted an exceedingly beneficent influence. All know with what “*odium generis humani*,” with what spiritual self-conceit, the Jews abhorred all Gentiles ; with what pride of culture and with what contempt the Greeks and Romans looked down upon barbarians. By the power of the Holy Ghost these insurmountable partition-walls were demolished as by a thunder-bolt. What had never before entered into the heart of man,—that Jews and Gentiles should meet as brethren without the Gentiles passing through the door of circumcision and the whole ceremonial law,—was through faith actually accomplished in Paul’s churches, at a time when the Roman eagle was mercilessly treading under foot the hardened Jewish nation and laying its sacred things in dust and ashes. Antiquity had not the remotest idea of a universal religion, which by the fellowship of faith and love should

annihilate the greatest distances of time and space, and bind all the nations of the earth together in one family of God. This colossal idea Christianity revealed, and in the apostolic age began nightly to carry out; not obliterating national distinctions, but recognising and indulging nations in their rights; yet at the same time truly drawing them together in a higher unity. The same brotherly love, which bound together the members of single communities, also united the various communities in one organism, forming the mystical body of the Redeemer, and presenting a spiritual temple of wonderful symmetry and beauty. Nor is this unity limited merely to the inward, invisible life. Besides unity of spirit, Paul explicitly requires also unity of body, as the necessary fruit and evidence of the former.¹ It must be admitted, to be sure, that this unity did not perfectly appear; that it was variously disturbed by the after-workings of the Jewish and Graeco-Roman national characters, and still more by Pharisaical and afterwards by Gnostic heretics. Yet it constantly tended towards perfect manifestation in real life, and in spite of all hindrances was rapidly growing towards full manhood in Christ (Eph. ii. 21; iv. 13). Whatever modern critics may say of the dispute between Peter and Paul, between Jewish and Gentile Christians, all the apostles perfectly agreed in their main principles. They were the personal representatives of the unity of the whole church, and all wrought, each with his peculiar gift and in his own way, towards the same end. Of this we have testimony in their writings; in their harmonious action in the council at Jerusalem, and their settlement of the great question of the relation of the Gentiles to the gospel; in the continual collections made by the apostle of the Gentiles in his Grecian churches for the poor Jewish Christians in Palestine. For these collections were designed by no means merely to furnish outward aid, but to attest practically, and to promote, the fraternal communion between the two great sections of the church.² Thus could Paul write with truth to the Ephesians, that Christ, our peace, has by His atoning work broken down the wall between Jews and Gentiles, abolished the enmity, made of the two one

¹ Comp. Eph. iv. 4: "Εν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα; ii. 19-22; and particularly 1 Cor. xii. 13.

² Gal. ii. 10. 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4. 2 Cor. ix. 12-15. Rom. xv. 25-27.

new man in himself, and reconciled both in one body to God (Eph. ii. 14–22).—Rome, with all her spirit of conquest and her wonderful governmental talents, could erect only a giant body without a soul, a mechanical conglomeration of nations, which has long ago fallen to pieces; while the spiritual edifice of the Christian church still stands unshaken, and is continuing and will continue to enlarge itself, until it shall have wrought all nations as living stones into its walls.

CHAPTER II.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

§ 116. *Nature and Classification of the Charisms.*

THIS power of the Apostolic church to transform and sanctify all the moral relations of life had its ground in special gifts of divine grace, with which that church was endowed. These wrought together in organic harmony for the inward edification of the body of Christ and for the conversion of the world without. They formed, as it were, the sparkling bridal ornament of this first creative epoch of Christianity. Paul treats of them particularly in the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of his first epistle to the Corinthians.

By the expression *spiritual gift* or *gift of grace*, χάρισμα, ἐνεργημα, the apostle means “a revelation of the Spirit for the common good;”¹ that is, not faith in general, which constitutes the essence of the whole Christian disposition, but a particular energy and utterance of the believer’s life, prompted and guided by the Holy Ghost, for the edification of the church; the predominant religious qualification, the peculiar divine talent of the individual, by which he is to perform his function, as an organic member, in the vital action of the whole, and promote its growth. It is, therefore, as the name itself implies, something supernaturally wrought, and bestowed by free grace (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 11); yet it forms itself, like Christianity in general, upon the natural basis prepared for it in the native intellectual and moral capacities of the man, which are in fact themselves gifts of God. These natural qualities it baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire,

¹ Φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, 1 Cor. xii. 7; πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας xiv. 12; comp. Eph. iv. 12.

and rouses to higher and freer activity. The charisms are many, corresponding to the various faculties of the soul and the needs of the body of Christ; and in this very abundance and diversity of gifts are revealed the riches of givine grace (ποικίλη χάρις θεοῦ, 1 Peter iv. 10). As, however, they all flow from the same source, are wrought by the Holy Ghost, and are gifts of free grace; so they all subserve the same end, the edification of the body of Christ. Hence the apostle applies to them the beautiful simile of the bodily organism, the harmonious co-operation of different members.¹ To this practical design the term *administrations*, or *ministry*,² no doubt refers. Every one has "his proper gift," which best corresponds to his natural peculiarity, and is indispensable for his sphere of activity.³ But several charisms may also be united in one individual. This was the case particularly with the apostles, whose office in fact originally included all other spiritual offices and their functions, even to the diaconate (comp. Acts iv. 35, 37; vi. 2). It is true they all had not these gifts in equal measure. John seems to have possessed especially the charisms of love, profound knowledge, and prophecy; Peter, those of church government and discipline, miracles, and discernment of spirits (comp. Acts v. 1, *et seq.*); James, those of the faithful episcopal superintendence of a congregation, and silent, patient service at the altar. Most variously endowed in this respect was St Paul, eminent alike in knowing and in setting forth divine mysteries; fitted both for the labours of a pioneer, and for preserving and confirming established order; at home among visions and revelations; excelling all the Corinthians in the gift of tongues (1 Cor. xiv. 18); and accredited among them by signs and wonders (2 Cor. xii. 12).

The greatest movements in the history of the world always proceed from individuals uncommonly gifted, in whom the scattered mental energies of their age are harmoniously concentrated. Of course, however, the number or strength of the charisms establishes no merit or preference as to the attainment of salvation. For this, living faith in Christ is sufficient. The charisms are free gifts of grace; and the man is responsible, not

¹ Rom. xii. 4-6. 1 Cor. xii. 12, *et seq.*

² Διανομία, 1 Cor. xii. 5; comp. Eph. iv. 12. 1 Peter iv. 10.

³ 1 Cor. vii. 7; xii. 11. Rom. xii. 6. 1 Peter iv. 10.

for the possession, but for the use of them. Every spiritual gift is liable to abuse. Spiritual knowledge may puff up (1 Cor. viii. 1). The gift of tongues may foster vanity and the disposition to monopolize the benefit of worship in self-edifying rapture (xiv. 2, *et seq.*) And every gift is attended with heavy responsibility. Hence the apostle's earnest commendation of love, which alone would prevent such abuse of other gifts, and make their exercise pleasing to God. The value of the gifts varied; not depending, however, as many of the Corinthians thought, on their splendour and outward effect, but on their practical utility for building up the kingdom of God (1 Cor. xii. 31; xiv. 3, *et seq.*)

This extraordinary operation of the Spirit showed itself first in the apostles on the day of Pentecost, the birth-day of the church.¹ Thence it followed the steps of the heralds of the gospel as a holy energy, awakening in every susceptible soul a depth of knowledge, a power of will, and a jubilee of heavenly joy, which formed a glowing contrast with the surrounding paganism. For the Lord had promised (Mark xvi. 17, 18), that the gifts of speaking with tongues, casting out devils, and healing, should be not confined to a few, but bestowed on the mass of believers. This blooming glory of the infant church unfolded itself most luxuriantly among the intellectual, excitable, gifted Greeks, especially in the Corinthian church. But there too the dangers and abuses attending it most frequently appeared. The usual medium of communicating spiritual gifts was the laying on of the apostles' hands (Acts viii. 17; xix. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14). Yet on Cornelius and his company the Holy Ghost fell immediately after the simple preaching of the gospel, and they began to speak with tongues and prophesy, to the great astonishment of the Jewish-Christian brethren, before Peter had baptized them (Acts x. 44, 46).

It is the prevailing view, that the charisms, some of them at least, as those of miracles and tongues, belong not essentially

¹ Some of these gifts, as those of prophecy and miracles, meet us, indeed, even in the Old Testament; and, before the resurrection of Christ, we find the disciples healing the sick and casting out devils (Matth. x. 8. Mark vi. 13). But the *permanent* possession of the Holy Ghost as the Spirit of *Christ* was attached to His glorification and exaltation to the right hand of the Father (John vii. 39).

and permanently to the church, but were merely a temporary adventitious efflorescence of the apostolic period, an ornamental appendage, like the wedding-dress of a youthful bride, and afterwards disappeared from history, giving place to the regular and natural kind of moral and religious activity.¹ The Irvingites, on the contrary, like the Montanists of the second century, look upon these apostolic gifts and offices as the necessary conditions of a healthy state of the church at any time; make their disappearance the fault of Christianity; and hold it impossible to remedy the defects of the church without a revival of the charisms and the apostolate. They appeal to such passages as 1 Cor. xii. 27-31; Eph. iv. 11-13, where undue emphasis is laid on "till;" and to 1 Thess. v. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xii. 31; xiv. 1, where the apostle not only warns Christians against quenching the holy fire of the Spirit, but also positively requires them to strive earnestly after His miraculous gifts.² There seems to

¹ So, among the ancients, Chrysostom, who begins his twenty-ninth homily on the epistle to the Corinthians with these words: Τοῦτο ἅπαν τὸ χαρίον σφόδρα ἐστὶν ἀσάφες, τὴν δὲ ἀσάφειαν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀγνοία τε καὶ ἑλλειψις ποιεῖ, τῶν τότε μὲν συμβαινόντων, νῦν δὲ οὐ γινομένων. Comp. similar passages of this father, and of St Augustine, quoted by Tholuck, in his article on the miracles of the Cath. Church (*Verm. Schriften*, II. 35, *et seq.*), from which so much appears, at all events, that these fathers considered the miracles at their time as a very rare occurrence, although they report in other passages cases of remarkable visions, miraculous healing, etc. Among moderns compare, for example, Olshausen (*Comment.* III. p. 683), who makes the charismatic form of the Spirit's operation cease with the third century. With special distinctness this view is expressed by Trautmann as follows (*Die Apostol. Kirche*. 1848, p. 309): "As in the case of marriage the festivity of the wedding-day cannot always last, any more than the inspiration of the first love when the seriousness and steady activity of the common pilgrimage just begun comes on; as, according to the universal order or nature, the blossom must fall away, if the fruit is to thrive—though, on the other hand, the fruit does not appear without the preceding blossom;—so that gush of heavenly powers on the day of Pentecost *could* not, *must* not, continue in the church. It could not—because the earthly human nature is not able constantly to bear the bliss of ecstacy and such mighty streams of power from above, as is shown by the example of the three chosen disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration. It must not—because the continuance of the blossom would have hindered the development of the fruit. The splendour of these higher powers would unavoidably have fixed the eye and the heart too much on externals, and the proper object and work of faith, the inward conquest of the world, would have been neglected."

² So Thiersch, the (only) scientific theologian of the Irvingite community, in his *Vorlesungen über Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, I. 80 (2d ed.); comp. my articles on *Irvingism and the church question* in the "*Deutsche Kirchenfreund*," vol. iii., Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6, particularly p. 223, *et seq.*—The Mormons, too, or "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints," whose rise (April 6, 1830) was almost simul-

us to be here a mixture of truth and error on both sides. In these charisms we must distinguish between the essence and the temporary form. The first is permanent; the second has disappeared, yet breaks out at times sporadically, though not with the same strength and purity as in the apostolic period. In the nature of the case, the Holy Ghost, when first entering into humanity, came with peculiar creative power, copiousness, and freshness; presented a striking contrast to the mass of the unchristian world; and by this very exhibition of what was extraordinary and miraculous exerted a mighty attraction upon the world, without which it could never have been conquered. Christianity, however, aims to incorporate herself in the life of humanity, enter into all its conditions and spheres of activity as the ruling principle, and thus to become the second, higher nature. As it raises the natural more and more into the sphere of the Spirit, so in this very process it makes the supernatural more and more natural. These are but two aspects of one and the same operation. Accordingly we find, that as fast as the reigning power of heathenism is broken, those charisms which exhibited most of the miraculous become less frequent, and after the fourth century almost entirely disappear. This is not owing to a fault of Christianity; for at that very time the church produced some of her greatest teachers, her Athanasius and her Ambrose, her Chrysostom and her Augustine. It is rather a result of its victory over the world. Spiritual gifts, however, did not then fully and for ever disappear. For in times of great awakening and of the powerful descent of the Spirit, in the creative epochs of the church, we now and then observe phenomena quite similar to those of the first century, along with the corresponding dangers and abuses and even Satanic imitations and caricatures. These manifestations then gradually cease again according to the law of the development of a new principle as just stated. Such facts of experience may serve to confirm and

taneous with the appearance of Irvingism in England, notwithstanding their radical difference in spirit and conduct, likewise claim to possess all the offices and spiritual gifts of the apostolic church. Their founder, Joseph Smith, lays down, among other articles of faith: "We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive church, viz., apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc. We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues," etc. (*Hist. of all the Relig. Denominations in the U. S.*, p. 348, 2d ed.)

illustrate the phenomena of the apostolic age. In judging of them, moreover, particularly of the mass of legends of the Roman church, which still lays claim to the perpetual possession of the gift of miracles, we must proceed with the greatest caution and critical discrimination. In view of the over-valuation of charisms by the Montanists and Irvingites, we must never forget that Paul puts those which most shun free inspection, and most rarely appear, as the gift of tongues, far beneath the others, which pertain to the regular vital action of the church, and are at all times present in larger or smaller measure, as the gifts of wisdom, of knowledge, of teaching, of trying spirits, of government, and, above all, of love, that greatest, most valuable, most useful, and most enduring of all the fruits of the Spirit (1 Cor. xiii.)

Finally, as to the *classification* of the charisms. They have often been divided into extraordinary or supernatural in the strict sense, and ordinary or natural.¹ But this is improper, for, on the one hand, they all rest on a natural basis, even the gift of miracles (upon the dominion of mind over body, of will over matter), and, on the other, they are all supernatural. St Paul derives them all from one and the same Spirit, and it is only their supernatural, divine element that makes them charisms. Nor, according to what has been already said, can the division into permanent, or those which belong to the church at all times, and transitory, or such as are confined to the apostolic period, be strictly carried out. We, therefore, propose a psychological classification, on the basis of the three *primary faculties of the soul*; they all being capable and in need of sanctification, and the Holy Ghost in fact leaving none of them untouched, but turning them all to the edification of the church. With this corresponds also the classification according to the different *branches of the church-life*, in which the activity of one or the other of these faculties thus supernaturally elevated predominates. This would give us three classes of charisms: (1) Those which relate especially to *feeling* and *worship*; (2) Those which relate to *knowledge* and *theology*; (3) Those which relate to *will* and *church government*. To the gifts of feeling belong speaking with tongues,

¹ By Neander, also by Conybeare and Howson, *the Life and Epistles of St Paul*. (London, 1853), I., p. 459.

interpretation of tongues, and inspired prophetic discourse; to the theoretical class, or gifts of intellect, belong the charisms of wisdom and of knowledge, of teaching and of discerning spirits; to the practical class, or gifts of will, the charisms of ministration, of government, and of miracles. *Faith* lies back of all, as the motive power, taking up the whole man, and bringing all his faculties into contact with the divine Spirit, and under His influence and control.

§ 117. *Gifts of Feeling.*

The gifts of elevated religious feeling, which manifest themselves in divine worship, are:

1. *Speaking with tongues.* This is an abbreviation for the original, complete expression, “speaking with *new*” (divinely suggested) or “with *other*” (than the usual) “tongues” (*i.e.*, languages), comp. Mark xvi. 17; Acts ii. 4. To what we have already said (§ 55), respecting this remarkable manifestation, we here add the following observations; confining ourselves, however, to the speaking with tongues in the churches founded by Paul. With this the phenomenon of Pentecost was closely allied, indeed, but in the mode of expression, and partly also in the object, by no means identical. According to the older and still very prevalent view, the speaking with tongues, even that mentioned by Paul, would mean speaking in foreign languages not learned by the apostles in the natural way,—languages, with which first they themselves on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards other believers, were suddenly endowed for the more rapid spread of the gospel. But here arise insuperable difficulties. (*a*) The Greek, which had become, since the conquests of Alexander the Great, not without the ordering of Providence, the prevailing written and spoken language even of the western countries of Asia, was sufficient for the preaching of the gospel in almost all parts of the Roman empire, at least in the cities; and in this empire, which embraced the whole civilised world, Christianity must first of all gain firm foothold, in order to become at all a power in history. To it, therefore, the leading apostles confined their labours; and in the Greek language, the most beautiful in the world, they composed all their writings, even when they wrote, like James, in Palestine and for Jewish Christians,

or, like Paul, to the Romans or at Rome. (*b*) It is the manner of the Holy Ghost not to exempt His organs from the natural difficulties connected with their work; but rather to leave these difficulties as perpetual means of moral training, occasions for practising self-denial, patience, and perseverance. And in fact, in the case of the missionaries to the barbarian nations, in which, by the way, the gospel got no firm foothold in the first century, if He has even lightened, He has hardly quite obviated, the labour of learning the barbarous languages. (*c*) We find hints that the apostles in truth did not understand all languages. Thus Paul and Barnabas seem to have been ignorant of the Lycaonian tongue; for they discovered the idolatrous intentions of the inhabitants of Lystra, not from their conversation, but only from their preparations for sacrifice (Acts xiv. 11–14). And as to Peter, a primitive and reliable tradition describes the evangelist Mark as his interpreter, with reference perhaps also to the Latin.¹ (*d*) In general, it is impossible to prove, that the speaking with tongues had any close connection with the missionary work. Otherwise, to what purpose would Cornelius have spoken with tongues before Peter (Acts x. 46), the disciples of John before Paul (xix. 6), and the Corinthians in their *congregational* meetings, and not rather before the unconverted? (*e*) Paul makes glossolaly, 1 Cor. xiv. 14–19, antithetic, not to the mother tongue, but, as the language of the Spirit (πνεῦμα), to the language of the understanding (νοῦς) and of every-day life, whether Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. Nor, had it been a speaking in foreign languages, would he have compared it to the indistinct tones of the harp or the trumpet, and declared it something unintelligible to all the hearers without the gift of interpretation; for in a large assembly there must have been at least some acquainted with the tongues spoken. The speaking with tongues, therefore, was unintelligible, because it varied, not from the vernacular, but from *all* tongues, even the barbarian; and, by his very comparison of it with the latter, the apostle at the same time distinguishes it from them (xiv. 11). (*f*) Finally,

¹ Papias, in Euseb. *H. E.* III. 39: Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γινόμενος, etc. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* IV. 5: “Cujus (Petri) interpretes Marcus.” Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.* III. 1 (in Euseb. V. 8): Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, etc. So Origen, Jerome, and others.

the oldest and original phrase, as used by our Lord himself (Mark xiv. 17): "to speak with *new* tongues," seems of itself to point not to foreign dialects—for these were not new—but to a language different from *all* dialects in use, a language of the new Spirit poured out upon the disciples.

If now, after all, the orthodox view has in the most natural sense of the second chapter of Acts, verses 6–11, strong, and indeed its only, support, we must regard the peculiar form in the first creative appearance of this gift on the birth-day of the church, not as the rule, but as an exception; and to explain the apostles' mysterious (and certainly but temporary) grasping of the languages of the assembled multitude (which were, however, almost all dialects of the Hebrew and Greek), we must suppose them to have been in such a psychological state, that they, in the first place, did not speak in languages not represented there (Chinese, Celtic, German, etc.), and, in the second place, were understood only by the susceptible hearers, being regarded by the ungodly as drunken.¹ In all other passages, on the contrary, where this spiritual gift is spoken of,² nothing requires us to understand by it a miraculous communication and use of the languages of foreign nations.

Speaking with tongues, as described from life by Paul, himself a master in it, is rather an *involuntary, psalmodic, praying or singing in a state of spiritual ecstasy and of the deepest absorption in the mysteries of the divine life*, when the human mind loses its self-control, and becomes a more or less passive organ of the Holy Ghost, an instrument, as it were, upon which He plays His heavenly melodies. Primarily, therefore, it has nothing to do with the outward missionary work. It is an inward act of worship, an ecstatic dialogue of the soul with God in a peculiar language, inspired immediately by the Spirit, elevated, but obscure and desultory, admitting of a certain

¹ The great condensation of Luke's narrative suggests the possibility that he has omitted to record the appearance, in itself highly probable, of other kindred gifts on the day of Pentecost; and that it was not the speaking with tongues itself, but perhaps the *interpretation* of them, and the *prophetic* discourses of the apostles, which took place in the various (Hebrew and Greek) dialects of those present. For, according to Paul's representation, the speaking with tongues was utterly unintelligible to the uninitiated, and even to the congregation, without an interpreter.

² Acts x. 46; xix. 6; and in the 12th and 14th chaps. of 1 Corinthians.

variety of form according to the character of the matter (*προσεύχασθαι* or *ψάλλειν*,) and perhaps according to the speaker's mother tongue and the degree of his excitement.¹ In precisely the same sense the apostle uses the phrase: "to speak in the Spirit, or by the Spirit,"² and distinguishes this from the ordinary speaking, which proceeds from and is meditated by the understanding, the self-controlling, thinking, and reflecting consciousness (*νοῦς*). Vehemently borne along by the Spirit, forgetting the world and himself, enraptured in the immediate enjoyment of the Deity, the speaker with tongues broke forth in a communication of divine mysteries, or a song of praise for the wonderful works of eternal Love.³ But instead of edifying the congregation, he edified only himself, unless either he or another translated what he said from this celestial language to that of every-day life (1 Cor. xiv. 2, *et seq.*) No one, who was not himself in ecstasy, could understand those lofty, solemn, mysterious tones, sounding, as it were, from the angel-world. To the uninitiated they were like the undistinguishable sounds of a musical instrument, or of a barbarous language, or, it might be, of a maniac,⁴ especially if many thus conversed with God at once (verse 23). To the unbeliever this spiritual language was at best a dumb sign (ver. 22, *εἰς σημεῖον*), suggesting to him the presence of a supernatural power and leading him to serious reflection. But the main object was the edification of the speaker *himself* (*οὐκ ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ, ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ*, verse 2; *ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ*, verse 4). Hence Paul gives the preference to the gift of prophecy, which addressed itself directly and intelligibly to the *congregation*; whereas the Corinthians were disposed to overrate the gift of tongues, as it made a greater show, and undoubtedly afforded the speaker himself peculiar enjoyment. It easily led, however, to a refined egoism and indulgence in a spiritual intoxication of feeling. To prevent abuse as much as possible,

¹ Hence the plural *γλῶσσαι*, and the expression *γένη γλωσσῶν*, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28.

² *Πνεύματι λαλεῖν μυστήρια*, 1 Cor. xiv. 2; *προσεύχασθαι, εὐλογεῖν τῷ πνεύματι*, verses 15 and 16. The dative here denotes the means.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 14-16. Comp. Acts ii. 11; x. 46.

⁴ Perhaps with reference to the divine *μανία*, the *ἐνθουσιασμός* of Pythia in giving out oracles, which certainly forms a parallel in Heathendom to the Christian glossolaly. In the ecstatic demonstrations of Montanism there was a confusion of natural and supernatural, heathen and Christian, elements.

the apostle directs that the congregation should not all speak with tongues confusedly together, but at most three on one occasion, and they one after another in proper order, and that one should always interpret the ecstatic prayers and doxologies for the benefit of the congregation. And if no one was present with the gift of interpretation, the speaker with tongues was not to express himself publicly at all, but to communicate silently with God (verses 27, 28). From this it appears, that the speaker with tongues, though he had not absolute control of his gift, could yet check the impulse of the Spirit, or at least refrain from audibly giving vent to it.¹

2. To the gift of tongues is immediately attached that of *interpretation* (ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 36; xiv. 5, 13, 26–28). This, so far as it calls into requisition the thinking faculty, might be reckoned also to the second class. It is the gift of translating the language of ecstasy or of the Spirit (πνεῦμα), into the language of the ordinary consciousness or reflective understanding (νοῦς), and bringing it down to the comprehension of the whole congregation.² For this reason Paul requires this gift as the complement to that of tongues; as by it alone the latter is made edifying to the hearers and conducive to the general good. Wieseler thinks³ that these two charisms always went together, and that the speaker with tongues was always his own interpreter. The passages, xiv. 2, 4, 16, are not, however, conclusive for this; while xii. 10 (ἐτέρῳ δὲ γένη γλωσσῶν, ἄλλῳ δὲ ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν), is rather against it. This, may, indeed, have been the rule; and from xiv. 5, 13, it would seem, that the speaker with tongues, when he returned from the state of ecstasy into that of sober reflection, himself interpreted what he had seen and en-

¹ The liturgical prayers (such as the Gloria in excelsis, the Te Deum), spiritual songs, and ehorals of the church, might be regarded as in some measure a compensation for speaking with tongues. Respecting the ecstatic discourses and exhortations in the Irvingite congregations, see the statement of Hohl, § 55, and the pamphlet of the "evangelist" Böhm: *Reden mit Zungen und Weissagen*, etc. Berlin, 1848.

² According to the popular view of glossolaly, the gift of interpretation would consist rather in the ability to translate from foreign languages into the mother tongue. But this power, just as the knowledge of foreign languages, may be acquired in an altogether natural way (and many an infidel has been far more proficient in it than any of the apostles); whereas, to constitute a charism, the supernatural aid of the Holy Ghost is indispensable.

³ "Theol. Studien und Kritiken," 1838, p. 719, et seq.

joyed, for the edification of the assembly. According to xiv. 28, however, there were also speakers with tongues who could not interpret, and who, therefore, were advised to keep silence in the assembly.

3. Closely allied to the gift of tongues is that of *prophecy* (χάρισμα προφητείας 1 Cor. xii. 10, 29; xiv. 1, *et seq.*; 1 Thess. v. 20; 1 Tim. i. 18; iv. 14). It commonly appeared at the same time and in immediate connection with the gift of tongues (Acts xix. 6). This too is an elevated utterance, under the influence of divine illumination and revelation, but not in proper ecstasy. The speaker's self-consciousness is in perfect exercise, and his address has direct reference to the awakening, exhorting, and encouraging of the *congregation*, without needing to be interpreted. It is for this reason that the apostle places prophecy above speaking with tongues (1 Cor. xiv. 1-5). On the other hand, this gift is akin to that of teaching (χάρισμα διδασκαλίας); but proceeds less from calmly-working thought and more from intuition and deeply-agitated feeling, addresses the affections, and tends more to excite and carry away the hearers. Paul, therefore, places prophets also before teachers (Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28).

As to the matter of the prophetic discourses; by prophecy in the strict sense, it is true, we understand the prediction of *future* events, directly or indirectly connected with the kingdom of God. So the "prophet," Agabus, in the church at Antioch, foretold the Palestinian famine of the year 44, that the Antiochian Christians might make timely provision for their suffering brethren (Acts xi. 28). So, as Paul was going for the last time to Jerusalem, his arrest was repeatedly predicted to him on his way, and finally in Cæsarea by the prophesying daughters of Philip, and by the same Agabus in a symbolical action (xx. 23; xxi. 4, 11). So, again, prophets foretold the rise of dangerous errorists; the appearance of Antichrist and his work; the second coming of the Lord; and the fate of those whom He will find alive.¹ Here belongs, also, the nomination of an individual for a particular office or duty in the kingdom of God. Thus the Spirit by the prophetic utterances of the congregation called Barnabas and Paul to the work of the Gentile mission (Acts xiii. 1, 2), and Timothy

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 1-12. 1 Tim. iv. 1, *et seq.* 1 John ii. 18, *et seq.* 2 Peter iii. 3, and the whole Apocalypse.

to be an evangelist.¹ But the office of the prophet must by no means be limited to this, even in the Old Testament, much less in the New. It was the prophet's duty to unveil, not only the future, but also the present; the counsels of God, the deep meaning of the Holy Scriptures, the secret states of the human heart, the abyss of sin, and the glory of redeeming grace. According to the representation of Paul in the fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, the prophetic gift showed itself generally in awakening and comforting discourses, by which susceptible Jews and Gentiles, present at the worship of God, were powerfully impressed, rebuked, and called to repentance, and believers were strengthened and animated anew (verses 3, 4, 22-25, 31; Acts iv. 36). For the spread of the gospel, therefore, for evangelists or itinerant missionaries, this gift was specially important.²

But along with the true prophets there were also false. Together with genuine, divine inspiration appeared also a mock inspiration, merely natural or perhaps diabolical. This called for the gift of discerning spirits, of which we are soon to speak. To prevent disorder and abuse, the apostle directs, as in the case of speaking with tongues, that the prophets should prophesy not all at once, but one after another, that all may receive instruction and exhortation (1 Cor. xiv. 31). He also requires that the spirits of the prophets be subject to the prophets (ver. 32); that is, that the prophetic excitement and inspiration be controlled and regulated by reason and regard for the wants of the church. The prophets, therefore, were not so much like mere passive organs as the speakers with tongues. They had a certain freedom, and hence were responsible for the exercise and application of their gift. Still less can an ordinary preacher excuse any extravagances and irregularities in his discourses or among his hearers by referring them to the irresistible impulse of the Spirit.

¹ Acts xvi. 2, compared with 1 Tim. i. 18; iv. 14.

² Powerful evangelists and revival-preachers, as, for instance, St Bernard, and perhaps John Wesley and Whitefield, whose words struck like lightning, and everywhere kindled life, we might call prophets in this more general sense. To profound church-teachers, also, who bring out the hidden treasures of the Holy Scriptures, and, with creative inspiration, break new paths for theology and the church, this term may be applied; and, in this more theoretical aspect, the charism of prophecy belongs at the same time to the second class of spiritual gifts.

§ 118. *Gifts of Knowledge.*

The theoretical charisms, which regard chiefly the doctrine and theology of the church, are :

1. The gifts of *wisdom* and of *knowledge* (λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως, 1 Cor. xii. 8 ; comp. πνεῦμα σοφίας, Eph. i. 17). The two are evidently closely allied, and denote in general a deep insight into the nature and structure of the divine plan of redemption and the whole system of saving truth. But as the apostle gives us no more particular information, it is hard to define the difference. According to the common view (that of Neander, for instance, and Olshausen), knowledge refers to theory, wisdom to practice ; while other interpreters (as Bengel) reverse this relation ; and passages may be quoted on both sides.¹ Perhaps knowledge is more intuitive and immediate, without regard to form ; while the latter takes in the accessory idea of dialectic development and artistic, brilliant discourse, as, for example, in the case of Apollos. This view enables us most easily to explain the bad sense in which σοφία is used in the first epistle to the Corinthians, with reference to the desire of the Greeks for wisdom and their over-valuation of eloquence and beauty of style (i. 18, *et seq.* ; ii. 1, *et seq.*)²

2. The gift of *teaching* (διδασκαλία, Rom. xii. 7, διδάσκαλοι, Eph. iv. 11 ; 1 Cor. xii. 28, *et seq.*) The current view makes the gift of teaching coincide with that just spoken of, the λόγος σοφίας and the λόγος γνώσεως being simply two branches of this διδασκαλία.³ It is true, in 1 Cor. xii. 7–10, where the several charisms are enumerated, διδασκαλία is not separately mentioned. But the gifts of helps and governments (ἀντιλήψεις and κυβερνήσεις, ver. 28) are also wanting here. The catalogue is, therefore, incomplete ; and it is a supposable case, that the same person may possess a very high degree of spiritual knowledge and yet very little power of communication. The gift of teaching always includes, indeed,

¹ In 1 Cor. i. 17, *et seq.* ; ii. 1, *et seq.*, and viii. 1, both are evidently theoretical ; while, on the other hand, in Col. i. 9, σοφία (in distinction from σύνεσις), and in Rom. ii. 20 ; xv. 14, γνώσις, are used in the practical sense.

² Yet, in 1 Cor. viii. 1, it is also said of knowledge, that it “ puffeth up ; ” that is, if separated from love. So Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 20, speaks of a ψευδώνυμος γνώσις.

³ So, for instance, Neander, *Apost. Gesch.* I. 245 : “ In the charism of διδασκαλία we find again the distinction of what are termed λόγος γνώσεως and λόγος σοφίας.”

the gift of knowledge, but not *vice versa*. The distinguishing feature of this gift, therefore, is the ability to unfold the treasures of the divine word and of Christian experience in clear, connected discourse for the instruction and edification of the congregation. While the prophetic address, in the glow of inspiration, speaks from feeling to feeling, and aims chiefly to rouse and reanimate; the didactic discourse is addressed, more in the form of logical exposition, to the understanding, and serves for the advancement and perfecting of the already established church. Hence at the beginning and at the creative epochs of the church, in the work of missions, and in seasons of powerful revival, prophecy comes out most prominently. In times of quiet stability, on the contrary, and of regular growth, the gift of teaching predominates. Yet neither can ever be dispensed with; both are essential qualifications for every minister.

3. The gift of *discerning spirits* (*διακρίσεις πνευμάτων*, 1 Cor. xii. 10; comp. xiv. 29; 1 Thess. v. 19–21; 1 John iv. 1) is of a critical character, concerned primarily with distinguishing true prophets from false, divine inspiration from human or perhaps Satanic. For where the powers of light are specially active, there also, according to the law of antagonisms, the powers of darkness also most bestir themselves. “Where God builds a church, Satan builds a chapel by its side.” So far this charism bears the same relation to prophecy, as the gift of interpretation to that of tongues, and serves as an effectual corrective of extravagances and abuses. But then the discerning of spirits in the wider sense denotes in general the power of keenly discriminating between the truth and error, which might be mixed together in the discourse of a genuine prophet—for none but the apostles have any claim to infallibility,—as also the power of judging characters and discerning motives hidden from the common eye. So, for example, by this gift Paul saw through the sorcerer Elymas (Acts xiii. 8–11), and Peter detected Simon Magus (viii. 20–23), and especially the hypocrites, Ananias and his wife, who imagined they could impose on the Holy Ghost dwelling in the apostles (v. 1, *et seq.*) This sacred criticism is, therefore, indispensable, not only to preserve purity of doctrine, but also for the proper administration of church government and discipline. Nay, every Christian should exercise it in a certain

degree; for Paul enjoins upon the congregation without distinction: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21).

§ 119. *Gifts of Will.*

The practical charisms, which have special reference to the Christian life and church government, are :

1. The gift of outward *ministration* and *help* (ἀντιλήψεις, 1 Cor. xii. 28; διακονία, Rom. xii. 7; comp. 1 Peter iv. 11). This comprehends, doubtless, the various duties of the office of deacon, and hence, above all, the care of the poor and the sick, the silent and unassuming, but none the less necessary and honourable work of self-denying love, which devotes either property, or what is more, all time and strength to the service of the needy in the church.

2. The gift of *church government* and *care of souls* (κυβερνήσεις, gubernationes, 1 Cor. xii. 28). This charism is needful for all rulers (προϊστάμενοι, Rom. xii. 8) and pastors (ποιμένες, Eph. iv. 11) of the church, or, to use their official title, for all (presbyter-) bishops, whose duty it is to feed the flock intrusted to them by the Holy Ghost (comp. Acts xx. 28; 1 Peter v. 2). But it was needful in the highest degree for the apostles, who had charge, not only of a particular congregation, but of the whole church. For the more extensive and varied the field of labour, the more necessary is the talent for organizing and the genius for governing. In the use of this gift there is great temptation to ambition, hierarchical arrogance, and tyranny over conscience, of which so many bishops, patriarchs, and popes have been guilty. Hence Peter earnestly warns the elders against perverting their power to selfish purposes (κατακυριεύειν τῶν κλήρων), and holds before them the pattern of the great Chief Shepherd, who, in self-sacrificing love, laid down His life for the sheep (1 Peter v. 1-4).

3. The gift of *miracles* (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28; δυνάμεις, verses 28, 29; also ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, ver. 10, or δύναμις σημείων καὶ τεράτων, Rom. xv. 19; comp. 2 Cor. xii. 12). This embraces all those supernatural healings of bodily infirmities and demoniacal states, all those miraculous signs, which the apostles and apostolic men, like Stephen (Acts vi. 8), wrought

by virtue of an extraordinary power of will,¹ in the name of Jesus and for His glory, by word, prayer, or laying on of hands. What is related of the healing power of Peter's shadow (Acts v. 15), and of Paul's handkerchiefs and aprons (xix. 12), borders on the magical. In the first passage, however, Luke gives us only the popular idea, leaving it undecided whether this was well-founded or sheer superstition. At any rate the healing power cannot have lain in these mere outward things, but only in the condescending grace of God, and must have been mediated somehow by the will of the worker of the miracle, and the faith of its subject. We must suppose the same in the analogous case of the healing of the woman with an issue of blood by her touching the hem of the Saviour's garment (Matth. ix. 20-22; Mark v. 25-34). Between the miracles ascribed by Luke to the two leading apostles, as wrought by them or for them, we may observe a certain parallelism. Compare, for example, the healing of the lame man at Jerusalem by Peter (Acts iii. 1, *et seq.*), and of the cripple at Lystra by Paul (xiv. 8, *et seq.*); the rebuke of Simon Magus (viii. 20, *et seq.*), and of Elymas (xiii. 8, *et seq.*); the raising of Tabitha from the dead at Joppa (ix. 40), and the restoration of Eutychus at Troas (xx. 9, *et seq.*); finally, the miraculous liberation of Peter (v. 19; xii. 7, *et seq.*); and that of Paul (xvi. 23, *et seq.*)

Miracles were outward credentials of the divine mission of the apostles and their doctrine, in a time and among a people which could be awakened to faith only by such sensible means. Hence they did not appear indiscriminately, but according to the circumstances and necessities of each particular occasion. In the exercise of the gift of miracles, the apostles never suffered themselves to be guided by private, personal considerations, but solely by regard for the glory of Christ and the advancement of His kingdom. When Timothy was sick, Paul recommended a natural remedy (1 Tim. v. 23), and he left Trophimus sick in

¹ This is doubtless what we are to understand by πίστις, 1 Cor. xii. 9, where it is mentioned as a special charism. It is not faith in general; for this, as already remarked, lies at the bottom of all the charisms, as the principle which works in them. The faith here in view is an extraordinary degree of practical moral energy, communicated by the Holy Ghost, in which reveals itself the superiority of sanctified will over nature. It is the *fides miraculosa*, the faith which removes mountains, and makes the impossible possible. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 2, and Matth. xvii. 20.

Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20; comp. Phil. ii. 26, *et seq.*) At Athens, where Heathenism presented itself more in a philosophical form, and where his Epicurean and Stoic hearers, in their scepticism, would probably have sneered at miraculous demonstrations of power as jugglery, Paul wrought no miracles; while at Ephesus, the centre of heathen and Jewish magic and sorcery, he wrought many.

§ 120. *Charity.*

Valuable and splendid as are all these gifts, they are still surpassed by *charity*, which alone puts on them the crown of perfection (1 Cor. xii. 31–xiii. 13). By this we are to understand not a mere inclination and emotion, however pure, or natural benevolence and philanthropy, however disinterested; but a disposition wrought by the Holy Ghost, springing from the consciousness of reconciliation; a vital supernatural energy, uniting all the powers of the soul with God, the essence of all love, and consecrating them to the service of His kingdom. Without this, even speaking with the tongues of angels were but “sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.” Without this, the boldest prophecy, the most comprehensive knowledge, and a power of faith which could call the impossible into being, have no abiding worth or practical importance. Without this, the other gifts would separate, pass into the service of ambition, and thus ruin themselves and the whole church. Without this, the gift of tongues fosters vanity and enthusiasm; knowledge puffs up (1 Cor. viii. 1–3); and the gift of government degenerates to despotism. As faith lies at the bottom of all the charisms, and forms their common root; so also love is properly not a gift by itself, but the *soul of all gifts*, binding them together like the members of a body, making them work in and for each other, and directing them to the common good. It maintains the unity of the manifold divine powers, subordinates everything individual and personal to the general, and makes it subservient to the interests of the body of Christ.

For another reason love transcends all the other gifts. It never ceases. In the future world the other gifts will disappear, at least in their present nature. The mysterious tongues will cease in the land where all understand them. Prophecies will

be lost in their fulfilment, like the aurora in the noon. Knowledge, which on earth is but partial, will merge in immediate, perfect intuition. Nay, faith itself will be exchanged for sight, and hope for fruition. But love, by which even here we have fellowship of life with God through Christ, remains love. It changes not. It rises not out of its element. It passes not into another sphere. It only deepens and expands. It can never gain higher ground, never reach another and better form of union with God; but only continues to grow stronger, fuller, more lively, and more blissful (1 Cor. xiii. 8-13).¹

Hence Paul exhorts the Corinthians, who were inclined to place an undue estimate on the more striking and showy charisms, to strive after charity above all, as the greatest and most precious gift, the cardinal and universal Christian virtue, of which Heathenism had scarce the faintest notion.² And he commends it in the most glowing and attractive description ever uttered by tongue of man or angel,—in language which comes to the heart with perpetual freshness, like music from the bowers of eternity, and is of itself enough to put beyond all doubt the divinity of Christianity and its infinite superiority to all other religions,—“And now (in the present earthly life of Christians) abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity.”

¹ “Charity,” says Bishop Warburton somewhere, “regulates and perfects all the other virtues, and is in itself in no want of a reformer.”

² “Heathenism,” observes Olshausen (Comment. III. p. 698), “did not get beyond *ἔρως*. It knew nothing of the Christian *ἀγάπη*. In the Old Testament nothing but stern *δίκη* reigns. Eros, even in its purest, noblest form, is but the result of want, the longing for love, springing from the consciousness that we have not what is worth loving. But the Christian *ἀγάπη* is the streaming forth of positive love—God himself, dwelling in the believer—so that streams of living water flow out of him” (John iv. 14).

CHAPTER III.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

§ 121. *Imperfections of the Apostolic Church.*

POWERFUL and pure as was the operation of the Holy Ghost in the first Christian communities, the ideal of the church was by no means perfectly realized. To the church and her individual members *holiness* is, indeed, explicitly ascribed as an essential characteristic. The church is, in fact, the body and the bride of the Redeemer, who has washed her with His blood; the temple and organ of the Holy Ghost, who never leaves himself without a witness in her. But this holiness of the church is not complete at once. It is growing, progressive—as are also her other attributes of unity and catholicity—and will be perfected only at the second coming of Christ. This is unequivocally implied in such passages as Eph. iv. 12–16 and v. 26, 27. And this continual process of sanctification is not always a quiet, unresisted advancement from the lower to the higher, but an almost incessant conflict with remaining sin, a subduing of diseases and violent disturbances, a surmounting of obstacles within and without. We must, therefore, though without abstractly separating the two, still observe a due distinction here between the principle and its perfect development, between the ideal of the church in Christ and its real manifestation among men. (Compare § 4 and 5.)

Accordingly the apostles, high as they tower above ordinary Christians, never lay claim to sinless perfection. None but one could ask without revolting arrogance and in the well-grounded consciousness of absolute holiness: “Which of you convinceth

me of sin?"¹ (John viii. 46). James teaches of himself with others: "In many things we offend all," and declares only those to be perfect, who offend not in a single word (iii. 2); which certainly can hardly be said of any man this side the grave. Paul confesses that he is not yet perfect, and has not yet attained the goal, but follows after it, forgetting what is behind, and reaching forth towards what lies before him (Phil. iii. 12-14); that he has the heavenly treasure in an earthen vessel, that the power of God may be made manifest in his weakness (2 Cor. iv. 7, *et seq.*); that he mortifies his body and keeps it in subjection, lest, having preached to others, he himself should be a cast-away (1 Cor. ix. 27). He lays down the general rule, that we must enter the kingdom of God through much tribulation, which is always directly or indirectly connected with sin (Acts xiv. 22); that we are saved, indeed, but in hope (Romans viii. 24). For his personal humiliation, and to aid him in his struggle against the temptation to spiritual pride, there was given him a painful malady, further unknown to us, "a thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7). John rebukes all assumption of sinlessness in mortal man as self-deception and falsehood. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John i. 8, 9).

After such concessions, we cannot wonder that history, at once to humble and to encourage, records some, though few, wrong steps in the lives of these holy men; showing that they were men like ourselves, as James reminds us respecting one of the greatest prophets of the Old Testament (v. 17). We have already noticed the war in dispute (the *παροξυσμός*) between Paul and Barnabas, which led to their temporary separation (Acts xv. 36-39. Comp. § 70); Paul's violent, but quickly checked anger at the high-priest Ananias (xxiii. 3, *et seq.* Com. § 83); the inconsistency of Peter at Antioch, into which he fell under the momentary influence of his natural fear of man, and for which he bore, with genuine Christian humility, the heavy charge of hypocrisy from a younger, or at any rate much later called apostle (Gal. ii.

¹ That the Saviour in this passage claims actual sinlessness, and not merely freedom from error, is shown by Ullmann: *Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, p. 64, *et seq.* (5th ed.)

11. Comp. § 70).¹ Of course, however, these were only transient failings, which stimulated to greater fidelity and watchfulness. For the general distinction, in fact, between the regenerate and the unregenerate is, not that the former are altogether free from sin, but that, if in unguarded moments they stumble or fall, they humble themselves before God, and if necessary before men; like Peter, they go out and weep bitterly, and find no peace, till they obtain forgiveness from the Lord.

If, therefore, even the apostles did not rise to the ideal of moral perfection, much less did their churches. This is evident from every part of the New Testament, which, in truth, consists largely of exhortations, warnings, and reproofs, not only for unbelievers, but also for believers. For Christians of Jewish extraction, especially for such as had been Pharisees, it was very hard to break away from a certain religious mechanism, from the bondage of the law and of ceremonies, and to rise from narrow particularism into the sphere of evangelical freedom. Of this the fifteenth chapter of Acts and almost all Paul's epistles give ample testimony. And then, on the other hand, the Gentile Christians were under great temptation to run to the opposite extreme of a false, licentious freedom. In the Palestinian congregations we frequently find an anxious, slavish piety, uncharitable prejudices against the free apostle of the Gentiles, and latterly, at the writing of the epistle to the Hebrews, which was addressed to those congregations on the approach of the heavy judgment of God on Jerusalem, a strong tendency to formal apostasy from the Christian faith. Many of the Galatians, deluded by Pharisaical false teachers, had become unfaithful to their instructors and benefac-

¹ On this the great Augustine, in his Commentary on Galatians, makes the following excellent remarks: "The one who suffered himself to be corrected, appears here still more worthy of admiration, and harder to imitate, than the one who corrected him. For it is easier to see what may be improved in others, than for each to see what needs improvement in himself, and cheerfully to receive correction therein, whether from himself, or, what is still harder, from another. This serves as a grand example of humility; and the doctrine of humility is the most important in the Christian system of morals; for by humility love is preserved." Comp. Neander's *Kleine Gelegenheitsschriften*, p. 18.—The generosity and forgiving disposition of Peter is especially manifest from his epistles, where he endorses the doctrines preached by Paul, and, after having spoken of the "long suffering of our Lord," and of the prospect of sinless happiness in the world to come, alludes (2 Peter iii. 15, 16) to those very epistles in one of which his own censure is recorded, and calls their author his "beloved brother!"

tors, "fallen from grace," and returned to "the weak and beggarly elements of the world." In the Corinthian church Paul had to censure the carnal sectarian spirit, the seeking after wisdom, the partaking of the heathen sacrificial meals, an inclination to unchastity, and a scandalous profanation of the Lord's Supper. Ephesus, Colosse, and other churches of Asia Minor, were threatened with Judaistic and Gnostic heresies, which are always more or less attended with practical errors. John found it necessary to lift his voice in those regions, not only against theoretical antichrists, who had gone out from the Christian communion, but also against lax morality, and a dangerous confusion of the love of God and our neighbour with the love of the world and of self. And when he wrote his apocalyptic epistles to the seven churches, a considerable number of them were by no means in a flourishing state. Ephesus had left her first love and was required earnestly to repent, lest her candlestick should be removed. In Pergamos many had been led away by the errors of the Nicolaitans. In Thyatira pagan vices were current. Sardis had a name to live, but was dead. And in Laodicea there reigned a spiritual satiety and lukewarm indifference, worse than even open hatred of the gospel; so that the Spirit threatened to "spew this church out of His mouth," unless it should repent.

A state of absolute purity, therefore, has never yet existed in the history of the church, nor can be attained till the second coming of Christ. Nay, there may exist in the earthly and unfolding state of the church the grievous sin of real hypocrisy. John (1 Ep. ii. 19) expressly distinguishes an inward, and a merely outward fellowship with the church. "In a great house," says Paul with reference to two pernicious errorists, Hymeneus and Philetus, "there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour" (2 Tim. ii. 20). And the Lord alone can distinguish with absolute infallibility the true and the false, the living and the dead members in the outward organism of His kingdom. He "knoweth them that are His" (ver. 19); and to separate entirely the tares from the wheat, is a work He has reserved for himself at the harvest (Matth. xiii. 30).

§ 122. *Nature and Object of Discipline.*

If now, on the one hand, a mixture of error with truth, of sin with holiness, is unavoidable in the actual church, and yet, on the other hand, holiness is essential to her idea and design; there arises the necessity of *discipline*, without which no well-ordered society of any kind can stand. By the exercise of admonition and discipline the church expresses her abhorrence of all evil, and is continually purging herself of all the ungodly elements which war against her nature, from “all filthiness of the flesh and spirit” (Eph. v. 25–27; 2 Cor. vii. 1). By this means also she formally expels from her communion dangerous errorists and gross sinners, so soon as they are known as such, and when repeated admonition, first private, then public,¹ has proved of no avail; and thus she restores her violated dignity, her proper character as the body of the Lord.² Neglecting discipline, she would necessarily come to a stand, implicate herself in the sins of her unworthy members, give free scope to the poison in her own organism, and thus procure her own dissolution. Relaxation of discipline is always a suspicious symptom; while the strict and energetic administration of it bespeaks moral earnestness and zeal for purification. One can feel no repugnance, therefore, to the stern precepts of the apostles on this point. John forbids even saluting a wilful and incorrigible Gnostic heretic (2 John 10, 11), Paul prohibits eating with a fornicator, a glutton, an idolater, a railer, a drunkard, or an extortioner, who still calls himself a brother, and claims the privileges of the church (1 Cor. v. 9–12), and he peremptorily requires that such an offender be put out of the Christian communion (ver. 13), with allusion to the injunction of the law of Moses.³

Church discipline is, therefore, primarily a process of *self-purification* in the church, designed for the restoration and maintenance of her essential attribute of holiness. But it necessarily has

¹ Comp. Matth. xviii. 15–18. Luke xvii. 3. Titus iii. 10.

² Rom. xvi. 17. 2 Thess. iii. 6–15. 1 Cor. v. 2, 6–13. 2 Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1. Eph. v. 11. 2 Tim. ii. 21. 2 John 10, 11.

³ Deut. xvii. 7, 12; xix. 19; xxi. 21. The admonition of the offender corresponds nearly to the first stage of the Jewish ban (Niddui); but the anathema or excommunication, to the Jewish Cherem or Shammatha.

reference also to the good of the offender, on whom it is exercised. And here appears its evangelical element; since even in its strongest form, the anathema it has in view, not punishment but *correction*, the reclaiming of the *soul*, to which the temporal punishment is intended to serve only as a means. This is what the apostle intends by delivering a backslider “unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus” (1 Cor. v. 5). In this much-mistaken passage, as in the book of Job, and 2 Cor. xii. 7, Satan is conceived as a servant of God in the wider sense, as a being to whom power is committed to send upon men certain bodily chastisements and afflictions, but under the oversight and for the ends of Providence. So in the case before us Paul expected that God, by means of the prince of darkness, would bring upon the excommunicated fornicator at Corinth some heavy trial or sudden calamity, but that this punishment might arrest the sinful course of the unfortunate man, drive him to repentance, and result in his salvation in the day of the second coming of Christ. For not only in the Old Testament, but also in the New, diseases and premature death sometimes appear as direct visitations from God for certain sins (1 Cor. xi. 30; James v. 14–16). In precisely the same way the apostle proceeds with Hymeneus and Philetus, who by their false teachings had brought mischief and confusion into the church. These also he “delivered unto Satan” by excommunication, “that they might learn not to blaspheme” (1 Tim. i. 20). According to the same view, we shall doubtless have to understand the anathema which he utters (Gal. i. 8) upon all adulterators of the one unchangeable gospel of Jesus Christ, neither as a mere outward excommunication, nor as an irrevocable, final sentence of damnation, but as the imprecation of some divine judgment, which, as a last desperate remedy, might effect, if possible, the conversion of the heretic.¹

¹ This view throws light also on the obscure passage, 1 Peter iii. 19, 20, and iv. 6, where even the judgment on the unbelieving generation in the time of Noah, nay, as we must almost infer from iv. 6, on all the dwellers in the realm of death before Christ, appears as but a transition state, after which follows either the rescue of the soul by the believing reception of the gospel of the Redeemer, or, in case of its rejection, the proper final condemnation. “For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are (bodily) dead, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι,” which perfectly harmonizes with the εἰς ὀλεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ,

Thus the design of discipline, in regard to its subject, is always the rescue of his soul by means of the heavy punishment of temporary exclusion from all the benefits of salvation ;—as, in fact, generally speaking, it is the office of the church not to destroy but to edify and save (2 Cor. x. 8 ; xiii. 10). If this end is gained, as it was in the case of the Corinthian offender, the sinner should be restored to the Christian communion and readmitted to the enjoyment of its privileges.

As to the administration of discipline ; this should be performed by the *whole congregation* in the name of Jesus Christ ; and even the apostles here appear only as the organs and representatives of the whole body. Paul, it is true, in his absence excommunicated the above-mentioned offender in virtue of the full power committed to him by Christ ; but he was united in spirit with the believers at Corinth, and, relying on their concurrence, he pronounced judgment in the name of all (1 Cor. v. 3–5). He took for granted that the whole congregation would look upon this grievous sin in the midst of them as a common misfortune, and would in solemn assembly formally ratify his sentence. For in the organic unity of believers, the honour or disgrace of one member falls upon the body itself, and the restoration of the moral dignity of the whole requires, therefore, such an act of the whole body.

§ 123. *Examples. The Hypocrite Ananias. The Corinthian Offender.*

In the comparative purity of the apostolic church we must not look for many acts of discipline. But those of which we are informed, bear the strongest testimony to the holy vigilance with which the apostles guarded the spotlessness of the bride of Christ.

The first case we meet with in the church of Jerusalem shortly after it was founded (Acts v. 1–10). This is the first dark shadow which falls upon the bright picture of the history of Christ's kingdom. The sin of Ananias and his wife Sapphira consisted in a shameful perversion of the community of goods to

1 Cor v. 5. Comp. also Thiersch : *Vorlesungen über Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, I. p. 89, *et seq.*

selfish ends, an attempt to impose by hypocrisy on the Christian community and the Holy Ghost, who dwelt in it. Ananias sold his piece of ground, but in concert with his wife, secretly kept back part of the proceeds, laying the rest at the apostles' feet in the common treasury. This was worse than if he had kept all. For he wished thus to have the appearance of a love which sacrifices all, while yet in heart he worshipped mammon. He wished to serve two masters, yet seem to serve but one. Peter, by the gift of discerning spirits (comp. § 119), saw through this hypocrisy and called it a lie to God and to the Holy Ghost. Struck by the rebuke of the apostle, as by a thunder-bolt, the guilty man fell dead upon the earth. Some have referred this tragical end to natural causes, perhaps apoplexy caused by terror and remorse. But ver. 9, where Peter *predicts* the same fate to Sapphira, of itself shows plainly that we have here to suppose a miraculous intervention of God. The Lord made the apostle's word the medium of an extraordinary punishment. The same divine judgment fell upon his accomplice, Sapphira, but not until time had been given for conscience to reprove her, nor until, ignorant of the fate of her husband, she had aggravated her hypocrisy by a deliberate lie. Had she penitently confessed the deed, she would undoubtedly have been spared. Thus, therefore, fell two as sacrifices to the good of all.¹

The unusual rigour of this discipline is accounted for by the circumstances. In the first place, the example of this hypocrisy, unless it had met exemplary punishment, would have poisoned the life of the Christian community at the outset, and undermined the indispensable authority of the apostles. And again, Ananias might very possibly have enjoyed, in this fair season of first love, deeper experiences of the power of the Holy Ghost, so as to have been far more guilty than Simon Magus (chap. viii.) or Elymas (chap. xiii.), who had merely come into outward contact with the gospel, and were, therefore, more mildly dealt with.

The second example occurred at Corinth, and has been already several times touched upon (1 Cor. v. 1, *et seq.*) A member of the church there had committed a scandal almost unheard of

¹ " Ut poena duorum hominum," says Jerome, " sit doctrina multorum."

even among the heathen. He had lived in incestuous intercourse with his stepmother, while his father was yet living¹ (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 12). When Paul to his deep grief heard of it in Ephesus, he, in the name of Jesus Christ, and as united in spirit with the congregation, though bodily absent, excluded the offender from the church, that such shocking disgrace might be rolled off from it, and that the backslider might, by remorse and the sense of estrangement from God, be awakened to repentance, and thus, though perhaps ruined in the body, be yet saved at last in the great day of final decision. Here the discipline was actually effectual. For from 2 Cor. ii. 5–10 we learn, that the unfortunate man was pierced with remorse and brought by loss of the gifts of grace to the brink of despair. Hence the apostle exhorts the congregation to forgive him and to show him brotherly love.

Here belong, finally, the excommunication by the same apostle of the probably Gnostic errorists, Hymeneus and Alexander, who denied the resurrection of the body;² and the command of the aged John, to have no fellowship whatever with those who deny the incarnation of the Son of God, not to receive them into the house, nor even to salute them (2 John 10, 11). Greeting is here conceived not as an empty form, but (like the ἀσπάζεσθαι, Matth. v. 47) as a testimony of real friendship, by which one professes his fellowship of spirit with the one he salutes, and makes himself partaker of his works (ver. 11, comp. 1 Tim. v. 22). This severity is by no means inconsistent with the mild character of John, but is in perfect harmony with his holy earnestness, which acknowledged only a love rooted in the divine truth, and with what Irenæus relates of his interview with the Gnostic, Cerinthus (comp. § 103). It must be remembered, that he is here speaking not of Jews or Gentiles, but of apostate Christians, who altogether rejected the central doctrine of the gospel, under the pretence of apprehending it more clearly and intellectually, and thus threatened to subvert the proper foundation of the church (comp. 1 John ii. 18, *et seq.*; iv. 3). We

¹ The Mosaic law assigns to this horrible crime the penalty of death: Lev. xx. 11. Comp. xviii. 8. Deut. xxii. 30.

² 1 Tim. i. 20. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 17, where Philetus is mentioned along with Hymeneus.

find just as severe expressions in Paul, Phil. iii. 2 ; Gal. i. 8 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Without the most rigid separation of truth from falsehood, the church, especially in that day, when she had scarcely gained firm footing, and was an object of violent persecution, would soon have become a medley of Christian and unchristian elements, and in the end the sure prey of the world.

THIRD BOOK.

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN GENERAL.

§ 124. *Origin and Design of the Spiritual Office.*

CHURCH GOVERNMENT has its foundation in the Christian Ministry, which is originally identical with the Apostolate, and contains the germs of all other church offices.

It was instituted, not by men, but by Christ himself in person. When our Lord was about to leave the earth, He gave His disciples, whom He had gathered around Him since His public appearance as the Messiah, and trained by a three years' personal intercourse, a commission to continue His divine work ; to preach the gospel to every creature ; and to baptize the penitent in the triune name of the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier of mankind. "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." For this purpose He imparted to them the Holy Ghost by an outward act, at first provisionally, afterwards in much richer measure on the day of Pentecost : "And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." With this gift He joined the power of the keys ; that is, full power in His name and with His authority to open or shut the gates of heaven, to proclaim and insure to the penitent the remission of sins, and to the impenitent divine judgment : "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and

whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”¹ Socinian and Rationalistic interpreters are wrong in regarding this as a special gift, attaching only to the persons of the apostles and becoming extinct at their death. The apostles here appear as representatives of the ministerial office in general, nay, of the whole community of believers, to which the right of church discipline is expressly granted (comp. Matth. xviii. 18, with ver. 17);—just as the promise of the continual presence of the Lord reaches beyond the apostolic age even to the end of the world (Matth. xxviii. 18–20; xviii. 20). The ministry of reconciliation is as necessary for the perpetuation of the church, as it was for its establishment. Hence Paul says of it, in comparison with the Old Testament ministry of the law: “If that which was done away was glorious, much more that *which remaineth* is glorious” (2 Cor. iii. 11).

The design of the Christian ministry is none other than that of the mission of Christ himself,—the redemption of the world from sin and error, and the extension and completion of the kingdom of God, as a kingdom of truth, love, holiness, and peace. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, are divinely appointed, “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry,”² for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Eph. iv. 11–13). The spiritual office, or the ministry (*διακονία*), is the vehicle of the powers of divine grace; the appointed channel for conveying the blessings of the gospel to mankind; the organ through which the Holy Ghost acts upon the world, and gradually transforms it into the kingdom of God. This office has various names, according to its different aspects and functions. It is termed the “ministry of the *word*” (*διακονία τοῦ λόγου*, Acts vi. 4), because the preaching of the gospel is its first business, according to the final commission of the Saviour, Matth. xxviii. 19, *et seq.*; Mark xvi. 15. It is called

¹ John xx. 21–23. Comp. Matth. xvi. 19; xviii. 18; xxviii. 18–20.

² *Διακονία* is here to be taken in its wider sense, as denoting the particular vocation assigned to each member of the body of Christ, for which he was to be fitted by the *διακονία* in the narrower sense, the ministry of apostles, prophets, etc. Comp., on this whole passage, Eph. iv. 11–13, the instructive and thorough exposition of Stier in his *Comment. zum Eph. Br.* II. p. 96, *et seq.*

the ministration of the *Spirit* (διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος, 2 Cor. iii. 8), which gives life, in distinction from the Old Testament ministration of the letter, which kills; the “ministration of *righteousness*” (διακ. τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ver. 9), which comes from faith in the Redeemer and avails with God, in contrast with the ministration of condemnation proclaimed by the law; the “ministry of *reconciliation*” (διακ. τῆς καταλλαγῆς, 2 Cor. v. 18), which Christ has established between sinful men and a holy God.

From this we see the immeasurable importance, dignity, arduousness, and responsibility of the ministerial calling. This office is the main instrument for carrying out the divine plan of salvation, and from it proceed almost all motion and progress in the church. The apostles, and in a wider view all ministers of the gospel, are “the salt of the earth,” which preserves humanity from putrefaction and gives it its proper savour. They are “the light of the world,” shedding the rays of eternal life into the night of the natural heart and upon all the relations of human existence (Matth. v. 13–16). They are “labourers together with God” (1 Cor. iii. 9), and “stewards of the mysteries of God,” which they should faithfully dispense, and of which they must one day give an account (1 Cor. iv. 1; Titus i. 7; 1 Peter iv. 10). They are “ambassadors for Christ” (ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν), who, as though God himself spoke through them, pray sinners in Christ’s stead: “Be ye reconciled to God!” (2 Cor. v. 20). Since the Lord himself appears in His servants, the reception or rejection of them is the same as a reception or rejection of Christ; the one is attended with a rich blessing, the other with a heavy curse. “He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me.”¹

This exalted position, however, of course gives the Christian minister no ground for self-exaltation, but rather incites to humility. Even a Paul, in view of the glory of an office, which is to believers a savour of life unto life, to unbelievers, of death unto death, exclaims under a sense of his own unworthiness: “Who is sufficient for these things?” (2 Cor. ii. 16), and refers all his qualification to divine grace alone (iii. 5, 6). As little may Christ’s stewards abuse their authority by lording it over the

¹ Matth. x. 40, *et seq.*, ver. 15. John xiii. 20. Comp. John xii. 26; xvii. 23. Matth. xxv. 40.

conscience and invading the rights of the congregation. They are bound rather to shine as an example to the people of Christ in holy living (1 Peter v. 3), lest, having preached to others, they themselves be cast away (1 Cor. ix. 27). As faithful shepherds, they must devote themselves in the most self-sacrificing love to the welfare of the flock purchased by the blood of Christ and committed to them by the Holy Ghost (Acts xx. 28 ; comp. John x. 12, *et seq.*) ; ever mindful that in the kingdom of heaven greatness and rank are to be measured on the scale of humility and love. “Whosoever will be great among you,” says our Lord to His disciples, “let him be your minister ; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant” (Matth. xx. 26–28 ; comp. Luke xxii. 26–30). For their office is in fact a service, as the original Greek term, *διακονία*, implies. Preachers are, primarily and in the highest view, servants of God and of Christ (2 Cor. vi. 4 ; 1 Cor. iii. 5 ; iv. 1) ; but for this very reason also properly servants of the congregation, for its eternal welfare. Thus Paul writes to the Corinthians : “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord ; and ourselves your servants for Jesus’ sake” (2 Cor. iv. 5 ; comp. Col. i. 25).

§ 125. *Development of the Church Constitution from the Apostolate. Officers of the Whole Church and of Particular Congregations.*

We have already remarked, that the ministerial office was originally one and the same with the apostolical. But as the church outwardly and inwardly grew, the apostles found their sphere of labour so enlarged, that they could no longer attend alone to all the duties of discipline and public worship, and were compelled to resort to a division of labour. In this way arose gradually, as the wants of the church and the force of circumstances required, the several offices, which have their common root in the apostolate, and through it partake in various degrees of its divine origin, its powers, its privileges, and its duties. The Lord himself gave no particular directions on the subject, but left His disciples to the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Under this guidance they proceeded with the greatest wisdom and consideration, following in the footsteps of history, and conforming as far as possible to the existing arrangements of the Jewish synagogue.

Hence the church was at first regarded merely as a sect or school (*αἵρεσις*, Acts xxiv. 5; xxviii. 22) among other sects, like the Pharisees (xv. 5; xxvi. 5) and Sadducees (v. 17), within the greater theocratic communion. Even Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, turned first to the synagogues and followed the order of their customary forms, till he and his disciples were thrust out of them.¹ We must here observe, however, that the analogy, which undeniably exists between the constitution of the apostolic church and that of the Jewish synagogue, must not be pedantically pushed, as it has been by many,² to all the offices and to the minutest details. It holds in reality only in the constitution of single congregations—only, therefore, in the offices of presbyter and deacon; and even here we must not overlook those differences, which necessarily grew out of the essential dissimilarity of the Christian and the Jewish principles.

In fixing the number and division of the church offices we must keep especially in view the passage, Eph. iv. 11, *et seq.*: “And He (Christ) gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” In the parallel passage, 1 Cor. xii. 28–30, evangelists are left out and in their stead workers of miracles and several spiritual gifts are mentioned along with apostles, prophets, and teachers. In these passages, at least the latter, Paul is speaking primarily, indeed, as the context plainly shows, of the charisms; yet these gifts are closely related to the offices, forming the divine qualification and outfit for them, their inward side, as it were; though the gifts might also manifest themselves out of the offices. Besides, the apostle does not intend to give a complete catalogue; for he passes over the

¹ Acts xiii. 5, 46; xiv. 1; xviii. 4–8; xix. 8–10; xxviii. 17–29.

² By Campegius Vitringa, for instance, who first brought out this analogy profoundly and fully in his celebrated work, *De synagoga vetere libri III.* 1696. Against him Mosheim's objections, in his *Institutiones majores*, p. 168–171, are in part not groundless. Compare on this point especially Dr Richard Rothe (now in Bonn): *Die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung*, vol. i. 1847, p. 147, *et seq.* This is undoubtedly the most learned and ingenious work of modern times on the constitution of the primitive church; and, in spite of its peculiar and almost universally disapproved views of the relation of the church to the state, and of the rise of episcopacy, it is a work of permanent value.

deacons,¹ whose existence is certain from the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles. Adding these to the list, and understanding pastors and teachers to be identical with one another² and with those elsewhere commonly styled presbyters or even bishops, we have five classes of officers; *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Presbyter-bishops* (uniting the functions of teaching and governing), and *Deacons*. These offices are so related to one another, that the higher include in themselves the lower, but not the reverse. The Apostles (as for example, John, the author of the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse) were at the same time prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, and at first had charge even of the business of the deacons (Acts iv. 35, 37; vi. 2). This universal official character belonged in the highest sense to Christ. He is expressly called Apostle (Heb. iii. 1), Prophet (John iv. 19; vi. 14; vii. 40; Luke vii. 16; xxiv. 19; Acts iii. 22, *et seq.*; vii. 37), Evangelist (εὐαγγελίστατο, Eph. ii. 17); calls himself the Good Shepherd (John x. 11); and condescends, notwithstanding His participation in the divine government of the world, to take even the title of deacon or servant (Luke xxii. 27; comp. Matth. xx. 28; John xiii. 14; Phil. ii. 7). And all the various branches of the spiritual office are the organs, through which Christ himself in the Holy Ghost continues to exercise on earth his offices of prophet, priest, and king.

But then there is this difference among these offices, that the first three have reference to the whole church, while those of presbyter and deacon relate only to single congregations. This gives us the distinction of *church* government and *congregational* government, which Dr Rothe especially brings out, though he wrongly puts the latter before the former. The whole system of government has formed itself from above downwards, from the general to the particular, and not the contrary. Even under the old dispensation the kingdom of God consisted not of any local assembly or single tribe, but of the tribes collectively. And this

¹ In 1 Cor. xii. 28 they are alluded to by the term ἀντιλήψεις, which denotes the spiritual gift answering to the office of deacon. Comp. above § 119.

² As may be justly inferred even from the fact, that the apostle does not repeat the τοὺς δὲ before διδασκάλους, but simply puts καί. Jerome well calls attention to this: "Non enim ait, alios pastores et alios magistros, sed alios pastores et magistros, ut qui pastor est, esse debeat et magister." So Bengel, ad loc.: "Pastores et doctores hic junguntur, nam pascunt docendo maxime, tum admonendo, corripiendo," etc.

conception passed over directly to the Christian communion, as the true spiritual Israel and the proper succession of the old faith.¹ This was made up of all in every nation, who were separated from the world by divine grace and called to eternal life (the ἐκλεκτοὶ, κλητοὶ θεοῦ); and this society of the elect (ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ) was distinguished from the ungodly world (the κόσμος), as were the chosen people of the ancient covenant from the עַמִּים, the ἔθνη, the nations by which they were surrounded.² The apostles, accordingly, are always named first,³ and all the other offices grow out of theirs, like branches from a common stock. The wide view of the church as the total of believers, the whole kingdom of Christ on earth, is the original one;⁴ the narrower sense of the term, in which it denotes a particular local congregation, as the church of Corinth or of Rome, is the derived.⁵ This appears at once from the passage, where the term ἐκκλησία first occurs, and that too in the mouth of our Lord himself. When Christ says of His church, “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matth. xvi. 18), we are obliged to refer this to the church in the complex view, since it is this alone which is indestructible; whilst single congregations and even large districts, once flourishing seats of Christianity, have perished entirely, or are now inwardly dead or overrun by a false religion, like Mohammedanism. In the first stage of Christianity the two conceptions properly coincided, the church being commensurate with the congregation at Jerusalem, and the apostles, therefore, being at that time also congregational officers. Yet their mission and vocation had reference, from the beginning, to the whole human family, to the evangelizing of all nations (Matth. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Acts i. 8).

¹ Rom. ii. 28, *et seq.*; iv. 11, *et seq.*, 16, 17; ix. 6, *et seq.*, 24, *et seq.*; xi. 1-7. Gal. iii. 7, 26-29; iv. 26. Col. iii. 11.

² Comp. Acts ii. 47; xiii. 48. 1 Peter i. 1, 2. Jude 1. Rom. i. 6, 7. 1 Cor. i. 2. Titus i. 1, etc.

³ Eph. ii. 20; iv. 11. 1 Cor. xii. 28; *πρῶτον ἀποστόλους*, ver. 29, etc.

⁴ Comp. such passages as Matth. xvi. 18; xx. 28. 1 Cor. x. 32; xii. 28. Eph. i. 22, *et seq.*; iii. 10; v. 25, 27, 32. 1 Tim. iii. 15.

⁵ Rothe himself allows this, p. 285.

§ 126. *Election and Ordination of Officers.*

The inward call to the spiritual office, and the necessary furniture of gifts, can come only from the Holy Ghost. Paul reminds the Ephesian elders (Acts xx. 28), that the Holy Ghost had clothed them with the pastoral office, to feed the church of God. But this does not exclude the co-operation of the congregation. True, the apostles were chosen directly by Christ, as instruments for laying the first foundations of the church. But so soon as there was a community of believers, nothing was done without its active participation. This was the case even in filling the vacant place of the traitor, after our Lord's ascension (Acts i. 15–26). Peter here lays before the whole congregation of about a hundred and twenty souls the necessity of an election, to complete the sacred number twelve; whereupon not merely the apostles, but the whole body of disciples, nominate (ἔστησαν, ver. 23) Joseph Barsabas and Matthias as candidates; all pray to be informed of the divine will (ver. 24); all cast their lots¹ (ver. 26); and thus Matthias is elected. Much more must we expect the general rights of Christians to be regarded in the choice of the ordinary congregational officers. When the first deacons are to be appointed (Acts vi. 1–6), the twelve call together the multitude of the disciples (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν, ver. 2), and require them to make a choice; the latter fall in with the proposition, make their own choice (ἐλέξαντο, ver. 5, connected with the πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος immediately preceding), and present the candidates to the apostles, not for confirmation, but only for ordination (ver. 6). As to the presbyter-bishops, Luke informs us (Acts xiv. 23) that Paul and Barnabas appointed them to office in the newly-founded congregations by *taking the vote* of the people; thus merely presiding over the choice. Such, at least, is the original and usual sense of χειροτονεῖν² (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 19). But even in a more general sense (like προχειρο-

¹ Either dice, or more probably small tablets, which were inscribed with the name of a candidate, and deposited in some vessel. By this mode of choice, which, as is well known, the Moravians imitate even in their marriages (though not so generally of late), it was sought to preclude all human will, and place the decision entirely in the hands of Providence.

² From χεῖρ and τέινειν, *to stretch out the hand*; hence, *manum porrigendo suffragia dare, suffragiis creare*.

τοῦ ἐν, used of God, Acts x. 41,) it does not exclude the co-operation of the congregations any more than Paul's charge to Titus, Titus i. 5.¹ For in the nature of the case the apostles and their delegates had the best judgment and the greatest influence in these elections. Probably in young, inexperienced congregations, they nominated the candidates themselves, simply calling for the concurrence of the new converts. But assuredly they always regarded in this matter the wishes of the Christian people, as may be seen from the direction in the Pastoral Epistles, that none but men of blameless reputation should be chosen to these dignities.² The formal right of the congregation to an active concern in all its affairs cannot be questioned, though the actual exercise of this right is conditioned by the degree of their spiritual maturity. All authority and power comes, indeed, from God, the only Sovereign, and from the Holy Ghost, the Ruler and Soul of the church; but the conveyance of it to a particular individual must be mediated, even for the sake of order, by some sort of human agency. And why may not the divine will be revealed through the body of Christians, full as well as through one or more individuals? The democratic principle, no doubt, has its dangers. But these are found to the same extent, only in other forms, in monarchy and aristocracy; and in proportion as the true spirit of Christianity prevails, they disappear.

This view of the way of appointing congregational officers is confirmed by the testimony of the apostolic father, Clement of Rome, who says explicitly in his first epistle to the Corinthians, that the apostles appointed bishops and deacons "with the concurrence of the whole church."³

¹ Comp. Rothe, l. c. p. 150, and Neander, *Ap. Gesch.* I. p. 268.

² 1 Tim. iii. 2, 7, 10. Titus i. 6, 7. Similar to this was the way of choosing the rulers of synagogues, whose solemn induction into office did not take place till the congregation had given their assent.

³ συνευδοκῆσάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, *Epist. ad Corinth.* I. c. 44. Even Cyprian, in the third century, who is known to mark an epoch in the development of hierarchy, says of the choice of priests: "Quod et ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos *plebe praesente sub omnium oculis* deligatur et dignus atque idoneus *publico* iudicio ac testimonio comprobetur ut plebe praesente vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita praedicentur, et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quae *omnium suffragio et iudicio* fuerit examinata (*Ep.* 68, p. 118, ed. Bened. I. p. 118, et seq., ed. Tauchn.)

After the election followed the ordination, or the solemn induction into office by prayer and the laying on of hands (a ceremony borrowed from Judaism, comp. Num. xxvii. 18, 23), the symbol and medium of the communication of the grace prayed for and necessary for the office. So in the ordination of the deacons (Acts vi. 6, *καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας*). It was natural that the apostles themselves should perform this important act, where they were present. In their absence it was performed by their delegates, as Timothy and Titus; compare Titus i. 5, and 1 Tim. v. 22, where Timothy is cautioned against *hastily* ordaining any one (*χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει*), lest he should become a partaker of other men's sins. From 1 Tim. iv. 14, however, it appears that the presbyter-bishops also might ordain, or at least assist in the ceremony. For Paul there exhorts his disciple not to neglect the gift, which was given him in consequence of the prophetic utterances of the congregation (comp. 1 Tim. i. 18, and Acts xvi. 2), by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery or college of elders (*τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*). From 2 Tim. i. 6 it would seem, indeed, that Paul himself was present on this occasion (*διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*); unless we adopt the untenable hypothesis that these were two different cases.¹ But at all events the part taken by the presbyters can have been no mere empty ceremony, any more than the participation of the congregation in the choice of its officers, but presupposes a right and a power lodged in their official character of conveying the necessary spiritual gifts. The laying on of hands on Paul by Ananias (probably a presbyter) mentioned Acts ix. 17, although no ordination proper, nor confirmation (for baptism followed afterwards), was the means not only to restore his sight, but also "to fill him with the Holy Ghost." The case mentioned Acts xiii. 3, was a special inauguration of Paul and Barnabas for the great missionary work amongst the Gentiles, and performed by the "prophets and teachers" (ver. 1) of the congregation at Antioch.

¹ As Rothe does, l. c. p. 161, note. This passage is discussed at some length, with reference to the views of English divines, by Dr Samuel Miller: *Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry*. Philad. 1830. 2d ed. p. 31, *et seq.*

§ 127. *Support of the Ministry.*

Respecting the maintenance of the various ecclesiastical and congregational officers, our Lord himself had already uttered the principle: "The labourer is worthy of his hire."¹ But He had previously warned His followers, not to turn the work of preaching into a common trade (Matth. x. 8, *et seq.*); for disinterestedness is one of the most needful and beautiful ornaments of him who proclaims the free, unmerited grace of God, and exhorts men to seek first of all the everlasting blessings of the kingdom of heaven. The same principle is laid down by Paul and illustrated by several apt similitudes; the soldier drawing his pay, the vine-dresser reaping the fruit of his vineyard, the shepherd living on the milk of his flock. So the minister of Christ, whose office is frequently represented by these figures, has a just claim to be supported by the church, for which he labours (1 Cor. ix. 6–10); especially as temporal gifts are after all but a poor equivalent for spiritual and eternal (ver. 11.) "Do ye not know," continues he, enforcing from another quarter this self-evident, but often-neglected duty, "do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel" (ver. 13, *et seq.*) When he writes to Timothy (1 Tim. v. 17): "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour," the idea of remuneration is at least included;² as is shown by the next verse, where he quotes the above expression of Christ along with the Mosaic precept enjoining mercy to animals (Deut. xxv. 4): "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn"—in other words (as here applied), show thyself grateful towards those by whose hard labour thou art served. The passage also, Gal. vi. 6, "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things," contains, according to the usual interpretation, an injunction to liberality towards the teachers of the gospel.

¹ Matth. x. 10. Luke x. 7, *et seq.* Comp. Lev. xix. 13. Deut. xxiv. 14.

² Many expositors refer τὴν μισθὸν here *exclusively* to remuneration, and translate it *reward*.

But the same apostle is equally earnest, on the other hand, in warning ministers against the love of filthy lucre, which is peculiarly unbecoming in them, and almost annihilates their moral influence. He exhorts them to contentment, hospitality, and disinterestedness.¹ He himself exhibited in his life an exalted model in this respect; earning his own support by his trade of tent-making, often working day and night, that he might not be burdensome to the churches, which doubtless consisted mostly of persons without property; that he might procure the readier access for the gospel; and might stop the mouths of his Jewish adversaries, who impeached his motives.² Paul could say without exaggeration, that through the power of Christ strengthening him he could do all things, knowing both how to be abased and how to be exalted; how to be full, and how to be hungry; how to abound, and how to suffer need (Phil. iv. 11-13.) Yet in the case of the church at Philippi, whose relation to him was one of special confidence and friendship, he made an exception, and sometimes received presents from it (Phil. iv. 16; 2 Cor. xi. 8). For though his earnings might have been enough to cover the cost of his own living, they could not well meet the expenses of his frequent and long journeys, on which he had usually several attendants, once as many as seven (Acts xx. 3, 4). When we consider these numerous and expensive journeys of the apostles and their delegates, to spread the gospel and to maintain and promote the unity of the Eastern and Western churches, while they might all well say with Peter: "Silver and gold have I none" (Acts iii. 6); and when we remember too, with how great zeal the Christians of Macedonia, for instance, notwithstanding their poverty, raised collections for their needy brethren in Palestine—we cannot but form a high opinion of the liberality and self-sacrificing love of these apostolic congregations.

It is not to be supposed, however, that there was in this period any regular and fixed salary for ministers. Many, like Paul, according to the custom of the Rabbins, may have continued their former trades in connection with their new calling, and may have thus earned a part or the whole of their subsist-

¹ Titus i. 11. 1 Tim. iii. 2, *et seq.*; vi. 6-10. Acts xx. 34, *et seq.*

² 1 Thess. ii. 5-10. 2 Thess. iii. 7-9. 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15. 2 Cor. xi. 7-10; xii. 14-18. Phil. iv. 15. Acts xviii. 3; xx. 34, *et seq.*

ence. At all events, those who had the right spirit, contented themselves with the simple necessities of life. So long as Christianity was not recognised by the state, the churches, as such, held no property. Many Christians, especially from among the Jews, might have adhered to the old custom of paying tithes (*decimae*) and first fruits (*primitiae*). But there was as yet no law about it.¹ All contributions for ecclesiastical or benevolent purposes were free-will offerings, regulated according to ability and need. Thus we read, Acts xi. 29, on the occasion of the famine in Palestine: "The disciples (at Antioch), every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren, which dwelt in Judea." So in the case of the subsequent collections for the poor churches in Palestine, Rom. xv. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, *et seq.*; and any salary for the preachers of the gospel would doubtless be raised in the same way.² Assuredly too the voluntary system, where it really merits the name (for many of our so-called voluntary donations are, at bottom, very involuntary, and proceed much oftener from selfish motives than from pure love to God and His church), best corresponds with the spirit of the gospel, and is upon the whole most advantageous to the kingdom of God. It calls forth a vast amount of individual activity and personal interest in church affairs; whereas the support of the clergy by the state, while it has many advantages, and may in some countries be necessary for the maintenance of religion, tends naturally to turn the church more or less into a mere civil institution, to make its ministers too dependent upon the government, to stunt the virtue of liberality, and to depreciate the gospel in the eyes of the people.

But where the church is thrown for her support so entirely upon the free love and gratitude of her members as in the first three centuries, it becomes the more necessary, if her operations are not to come to a stand, that she should recommend some fixed

¹ Legal enactments in regard to the payment of tithes are not met with in the church before the sixth century. But long before this Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.* IV. 8, 13, 18, etc.) was of opinion that the Christians should pay tithes like the Jews, so as not to be behind them in liberality and piety. So Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzen, Hilary, Augustine, and other church fathers. See Augusti: *Handbuch der Christl. Archäol.* I. p. 314; also Coleman: *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, p. 229.

² This spontaneous giving Tertullian presents as still the order in his day; "Nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert." (*Apolog.* c. 39).

system, some method for giving, by which each one may impose a law on himself corresponding to his means and resources. Such was the simple yet most judicious regulation which Paul made with reference to the collections for the poor in the churches of Galatia and Greece; that every one for himself, on the first day of the week, the holy day of the Christians (comp. Acts xx. 7; Rev. i. 10), should lay by a part of his earnings,¹ and so keep a separate treasury for the Lord as his means allowed and his conscience dictated (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2).²

§ 128. *Relation of the Officers to the Congregations. The Universal Priesthood.*

Notwithstanding the divine origin, the greatness and dignity of the ministerial office, there was not designed to be a chasm between it and the people, an opposition of clergy and laity in the modern sense. This office is not, indeed, a creature of the congregation. It is itself the creative beginning of the church, the divinely appointed organ of her establishment and edification. The apostles go before the church, not the church before the apostles. Hence they, not merely their doctrine or their confession, but they themselves, as living persons, in their union with Christ, and as organs of the Holy Ghost, are called the foundation of this spiritual edifice, of which Jesus Christ is at once the architect and the corner-stone, binding together the several parts and representing the whole.³ But so soon as the gospel had taken root and produced a Christian community, there arose a relation of active co-operation between pastors and people. Though the pastors retained the control, yet they always exercised it in the spirit of brotherly love, and with the consciousness, that the members of the flock stood essentially in the same relation with themselves to the common Head and chief Shepherd, Jesus Christ; that they were sanctified by the same spirit, and had an equal share in all the privileges and

¹ ὅ, τι εὐδοῦται, "as he may be prospered," "according to his success in gaining," or "as far as his means may allow;" comp. Rom. i. 10. Acts xi. 29: κατὰς ὑποδείξιμό τινος. 2 Cor. viii. 12: κατὰ ἐὰν ἔχη.

² On this the venerable Bengel well remarks: "Consilium facile. Semel, non tam multum datur. Si quis singulis diebus dominicis aliquid seorsum posuit, plus collectum, fuit, quam quis semel dedisset."

³ Eph. ii. 20. Comp. Matth. xvi. 18. Rev. xxi. 14, and § 90 above.

blessings of salvation. Hence all believers without exception are styled “brethren,”¹ and “saints,” separated from the world and set apart to the service of the Triune God.² While on the one hand, the churches were far from assuming authority over their leaders, and were instructed rather to yield them affectionate obedience (Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 16); the leaders, on their part, imposed no prescriptions or laws on the churches, which the latter themselves did not sanction by their own free approval. The officers formed no priestly caste, standing between God and the people. The New Testament it is true, owns the idea of the priesthood; but applies it expressly to *all* true Christians. All have immediate access to Christ by faith, and should daily offer Him the sacrifices of praise and intercession. In virtue of their union with Christ (*πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι*), Peter styles his readers “a spiritual house, an holy priesthood (*ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον*), to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ” (1 Peter ii. 4, 5; comp. Rom. xii. 1); and immediately after (ver. 9) exclaims to them: “Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood (*βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα*), an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light.” The same high character was assigned, indeed, even to the people of Israel under the old dispensation, where, nevertheless, we know that the special Aaronic priesthood was joined with it (Exod. xix. 6); “Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.” But in the Old Testament this was rather prophecy and purpose; in the New, it is fulfilment and execution. It is Christ alone who has “washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father” (Rev. i. 5, 6). The New Testament priesthood as far transcends the Old, as Christianity in general outshines Judaism. This is profoundly set forth especially in the epistle to the Hebrews (comp. chap. 7–10; xiii. 10, 15, 16). The term clergy (*κλήρος*), which in ecclesiastical terminology denotes the ministerial order in distinction from the laity, is applied by Peter to the congregations

¹ Comp. § 114 above.

² Acts ix. 32; xxvi. 18. Rom. i. 7; viii. 27; xii. 13; xvi. 15. 1 Cor. i. 2; vi. 2. 2 Cor. i. 1; xiii. 13. Eph. i. 1; ii. 19; v. 3; vi. 18. Col. iii. 12. Phil. i. 1; iv. 21, 22. Titus ii. 14. 1 Peter ii. 9, 10. Heb. xiii. 24. Rev. xiii. 10, etc.

(1 Peter v. 3); showing, that every Society of Christians is regarded, like the Levites under the old economy, as a consecrated, peculiar people of God.¹ The apostle Paul calls upon his readers, in virtue of their priestly character, to make intercession for himself and for all men (2 Cor. i. 10, 11; 1 Tim. ii. 1), after the pattern of Christ, the eternal High Priest (Heb. vii. 25; comp. Luke xxii. 32; John xvii. 9, 20).

It is by this universal priesthood, that we are to account for the *liberty of teaching* and the *participation* of the people in the *worship* and *government* of the church, which we observe in the apostolic age.

The general liberty to teach was a prelusive fulfilment of the prophecy, that in the days of the Messiah the Spirit should be poured out upon all flesh, even to servants and maids, and all should be taught of God.² Accordingly every one, whether an officer or not, if he possessed the requisite charism, might speak with tongues, pray, teach, and prophesy in the assembly. For spiritual gifts were by no means confined to official station. This freedom appears very plainly from the picture, which Paul draws, of the meetings for public worship among the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 23–36). Nay, it is plain from ver. 34 and chap. xi. 5, that even women, forgetting their natural place and mistaking the true idea of religious equality, prayed and prophesied in public. From 1 Tim. ii. 12, we may infer, that they also occasionally taught; else the apostle would not have found it necessary to forbid their teaching.³

But here restriction at once makes its appearance. In the first place, Paul rebukes in general all abuse of the liberty of

¹ Others take τῶν κληρῶν, which in any case refers to the people, to mean congregations distributed and entrusted to the presbyters by *lot* or election.

² Joel ii. 28, *et seq.* Isaiah liv. 13. Jer. xxxi. 34. Acts ii. 17, *et seq.* John vi. 45. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 9. 1 John ii. 20, 21, 27.

³ This primitive freedom was still understood by an ecclesiastical writer at the close of the fourth century, the author of the Commentary on Paul's Epistles, found among the works of St Ambrose (probably the Roman deacon, Hilary). Thus he says, on Eph. iv. 11: "In episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia primus sacerdos est, hoc est princeps est sacerdotum et propheta et evangelista et caetera ad implenda officia ecclesiae in ministerio fidelium. Tamen postquam omnibus locis ecclesiae sunt constitutae et officia ordinata, aliter composita res est, quam coeperat. *Primum enim omnes docebant et omnes baptizabant*, quibuscunque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio. . . Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, *omnibus* inter initia concessum est, et evangelizare et baptizare et Scripturas in ecclesia explanare," etc.

teaching, and reminds the Corinthians, that God is a God of order and not of confusion. They should, therefore, exercise their gifts, not all at once, but in turn, and always with due regard to the edification of the assembly.¹ James always chides the mania, with which many in his Jewish-Christian congregations (where acting was so often lost sight of in talking), set themselves up for teachers from pure vanity, without any inward call; and to this he adds his forcible representation of the sins of the tongue (iii. 1, *et seq.*) Thus the act of teaching, though not restricted to any regular office, must yet be joined with the possession of the necessary gifts; and these must be used in humility and under a sense of increased responsibility.

Then, secondly, as regards the female sex in particular, Paul goes still farther, and directly forbids women taking any part in the public services of the church.² This seems inconsistent, indeed, with 1 Cor. xi. 5, "Every woman that *prayeth* or *prophesieth* with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head;" and to this passage accordingly the Montanists, Quakers, and other sects appeal in support of their practice. But the apostle is here simply citing the fact, which undoubtedly occurred (comp. Acts xxi. 9), without approving or disapproving it, reserving his censure for a future occasion (chap. xiv.); for in chap. xi. he has nothing to do with public worship, but is treating of the custom of covering the head, which some Christian females in Corinth affected to disregard, in opposition to the prevailing ideas of propriety, as though all outward difference between the sexes had been abolished by Christ. Nor will it do to make a distinction here between public *teaching* and public *praying* and *prophesying*; to say, that Paul's prohibition regards only the first function (the proper *διδάσκειν*, 1 Tim ii. 12), and not the last two, which were more the expression of elevated feeling. For, not to mention, that the apostle places prophets above teachers (Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28), his injunction is altogether general, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, that women should *keep silence* (*σιγάτωσαν*) in the assembly, and not speak (*λαλεῖν*); and this whole chapter too treats, not of didactic discourses, but of the very functions of speaking with

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 12, 23-33. Comp. § 117 above.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 34, *et seq.* 1 Tim. ii. 12. In the synagogue also women were not permitted to speak; comp. Wetstein on 1 Cor. xiv. 34, and Vitranga, *Synag.* p. 725.

tongues and prophesying. Every public act of this kind implies, for the time being, a superiority of the speaker over the hearers, and is also contrary to true feminine delicacy. Christianity has, indeed, vastly improved the condition of woman. It has brought the highest blessings of heaven within her reach.¹ But it has not, in so doing, abolished the divine order of nature, which places her in subjection to man (Gen. iii. 16; Eph. v. 22), and restricts her to the sphere of private life. Here, in the quiet circle of the family, woman has the freest scope for the display of the fairest virtues. Here too she has a certain right to rule. And here she is bound, not only to pray diligently herself, but also to teach her children to pray, and to lead them early to the Saviour.²

With this state of things in the sphere of worship corresponded to a great extent the conduct of the church government. The presbyters were, indeed, the regular pastors and managers of the affairs of the congregation; but they shared both their power and their responsibility directly or indirectly with the people. In the first place, the officers, and also delegates for special purposes (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19; Acts xv. 2), were taken from the midst of the congregation, and were chosen by the people themselves or at least with their consent, as we have already shown in a previous section. Then, once in office, they were not to lord it over the flock, but to shine before it as patterns of holy living; to serve it; to control it, not by force of law, but through its own free conviction; and to pay due regard to its rights in all things (comp. 1 Peter v. 1-5). This was the course even of the apostles themselves. Almost all their epistles, with their instructions, exhortations, and decisions on the weightiest points, are addressed, not to the officers alone, but to the whole congregation. In matters of controversy it seems to have been customary (according to 1 Cor. vi. 5) to choose a board of arbitrators from the body of the people (comp.

¹ Gal. iii. 28: οὐκ ἐνι ἄρεσιν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. On the contrary, even Aristotle says unequivocally: χεῖρον ἢ γυνή τοῦ ἀνδρός, *Magn. Ethic.* I. 34.

² Probably also the prophesying of the daughters of the evangelist Philip in Cæsarea (Acts xxi. 9) occurred in family worship,—unless we suppose that here too was something which Paul would have censured (comp. Neander, p. 257). For Luke simply records the fact, without giving any opinion.

Matth. xviii. 15-18). Paul, it is true, excommunicated the incestuous person at Corinth; but only as united in spirit with the Corinthian Christians (συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος, 1 Cor. v. 4), so that his act was at the same time theirs. Nay, even in controversies, which concerned all Christendom, the apostles did not decide by themselves, but called the congregations, at least frequently, into consultation. We have a striking example of this in the council at Jerusalem for settling the great question about the binding authority of the Mosaic law, and the terms on which the Gentiles were to be admitted to the privileges of the Gospel.¹ Here the apostles assemble with the elders and “brethren;” the deliberations are held in the presence of the whole congregation; Peter urges his clear divine vision respecting the baptism of the Gentiles, not as a command, but simply as an argument (Acts xv. 17, *et seq.*; comp. xi. 2, *et seq.*); the whole assembly joins in passing the final resolution;² and the written decree of the council goes forth, not in the name of the apostles only, but also in the name of the brethren generally, and is addressed to the collective body of the Gentile Christians in Syria and Cilicia.³

This relation between the officers and their churches, to which the term *democratic* is sometimes, though not in strict propriety, applied,⁴ had a close connection with the extraordinary effusion

¹ Comp. § 67-69.

² Ch. xv. 22: τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

³ Ver. 23: οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῖς . . . ἀδελφοῖς, etc.

⁴ By Dr R. Rothe, for example, l. c. p. 148, and *passim*. We disapprove of this designation, because it is taken from a foreign sphere, that of politics, and may be easily misunderstood. Strictly, there is in the church no kind of dominion, neither democracy, nor aristocracy, nor monarchy; all is service (διακονία). The Saviour himself came into the world, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many (Matth. xx. 28. Luke xxii. 27. John xiii. 14, 15, *et seq.* Phil. ii. 6-8). Rothe, moreover, asserts this so-called democratic character only for the government of *congregations*, and not for that of the church as a whole. This last he rather styles *autocratic* (p. 310), and regards as having assumed the episcopal form before the close of the apostolic age, soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, particularly through the influence of St John. On the first point, however, he evidently goes too far, when, for example, he says (p. 153) of the congregational officers: “They were purely *functionaries of society*, a mere magistratus of the people, *whose authority flowed from no other source than the will of the congregation itself*, to which they owed their election.” Against this view compare what we have already said (§ 124) on the divine origin of all church officers; and, in part, the work of the Rev. Charles Rothe (since gone over to the Irvingites), entitled: *Die wahren Grundlagen der christlichen Kirchenverfassung*. 1844. P. 3-33.

of the Holy Ghost in the apostolic period, and was thereby secured against the abuses to which such a form of government is liable, where the mass of the people are under the dominion of ignorance and wild passion. We see mirrored in it, to a certain extent, the ideal state of things, which shall come to pass, when the prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh shall be absolutely fulfilled.

We must now take a more detailed view of the several offices of the apostolic church, beginning with those that look towards the church as a whole ; since this idea is anterior to that of a single congregation, though the two originally coincide as to extent, in the mother church at Jerusalem.

CHAPTER II.

CHURCH OFFICES.

§ 129. *The Apostolate. Note on the Irving.*

To be an apostle, the man must have been an eye and ear witness of the main facts of the life of Jesus,—above all of the resurrection (Acts i. 22 ; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1),—and called by Christ in person, without any human intervention. But here at once arises a difficulty respecting Matthias and Paul, who did not come into the original college until after the ascension. Matthias, indeed, possessed the first qualification (Acts i. 21, 22), but was chosen by men through the lot; and this without any special divine direction, but merely upon the motion of the precipitate Peter, who thought that the vacancy in the sacred number twelve, occasioned by the crime of Judas, must forthwith be filled without waiting for the promised outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Paul, on the contrary, had not known Jesus according to the flesh;¹ but to compensate for this, the glorified Saviour appeared to him in visible form on the way to Damascus (1 Cor. ix. 1 ; xv. 8), and clothed him with the commission of an apostle for Gentiles and Jews. Paul lays special emphasis also on the facts, that he was called to his office, not through human mediation, but immediately by the Lord himself; and that he had received His gospel, not from the older apostles, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 1, 11, *et seq.*) If now, however, we are still to hold fast the necessity and sym-

¹ From 2 Cor. v. 16, some commentators, indeed, would infer the opposite; but without sufficient ground. At all events, such an acquaintance would have been of no use to Paul, as he was then an unbeliever, and must have counted the Saviour either an enthusiast or an impostor.

bolical significance of the number twelve,¹ and are unwilling to confine it to the twelve tribes of the Jews, but refer it to all Christendom, the true spiritual Israel (as in fact the foundation stones of the heavenly Jerusalem itself bear the names of “the twelve apostles of the Lamb,” Rev. xxi. 14), there seems to be no alternative, but to pronounce the election of Matthias a well-meant yet hasty and invalid act, and to substitute Paul for him, as the legitimate apostle. On the other side there are reasons for assigning to the free apostle of the Gentiles a position altogether peculiar and independent. He never represents himself as one of the twelve, but seems rather to distinguish himself from them as one born out of due time, occupying a similar relation to the Gentile world, as the older apostles did to the Jewish.² At all events it is not advisable to extend the number of proper, regular apostles beyond Paul; though there were undeniably several more *apostolic* men.³

¹ The number twelve was so fixed, that the apostles are often called simply *οἱ δώδεκα* (Matth. xxvi. 14, 47; John vi. 67; xx. 24, etc.); even after the resurrection, when the college was no longer full (1 Cor. xv. 5). The church has, in general, always clung to this original number, though with some exceptions. The *Apostolical Constitutions*, falsely ascribed to Clement of Rome, speak (l. VIII. chap. 46) of thirteen apostles (*δικοατρεῖς ἁπόστολοι*), counting Paul the thirteenth. They also distinguish James of Jerusalem, the brother of the Lord, from the younger apostle of this name, but regard him as a man of apostolical standing. Eusebius, in his commentary on Isaiah xvii. 5, *et seq.* (in Montfaucon, *Coll. nova patr.* II. p. 422), assumes fourteen apostles, adding to the twelve Paul and the James just mentioned: *Δέκα καὶ τέσσαρας ποιήσει τοὺς πάντας (ἀποστόλους), ὧν δώδεκα μὲν τοὺς πρώτους ἀποστόλους εἴποις ἂν εἶναι, οὐκ ἐλάττω δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν Παῦλον, καὶ αὐτὸν κλητὸν ἀπόστολον, καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον γεγενῆσθαι, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, etc.*

² Comp. § 63.

³ Especially Barnabas, one of the two candidates for the vacant place of Judas; the person who first introduced Paul to the older apostles (§ 64); the companion of Paul in his first missionary tour (§ 66); and afterwards an independent labourer (§ 70), whose name is always mentioned with honour. According to Tertullian and several modern divines (*e. g.* Ullmann, Wieseler, Thiersch) he was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 6, joins him with himself; though he is here speaking not only of the apostles, but also of the brethren of the Lord, and in the superscriptions of several of his epistles he honours Timothy also with the same position. In Acts, Barnabas is at first put before Paul (even at the apostolic council, xv. 12; though the reverse order appears previously, xiii. 43, 46, 50); and twice, xiv. 4, 14, he shares with Paul the title *ἁπόστολοι*, though he is never called *ἀπόστολος* separately. The Greek and Roman churches designate him as apostle in their martyrologies.—In other places, where the word is used to denote mere fellow-labourers of the apostles, it is to be taken in its wider sense of *messenger, one sent*. In Phil. ii. 25, Epaphroditus is called *ἀπόστολος*, as the delegate of the Philippian church. So the *ἁπόστολοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*, 2 Cor. viii. 23, are delegates of particular congregations. When it is said (Rom. xvi. 7) of the Roman missionaries, Andronicus and Junias,

This peculiar personal relation of the apostles to Christ suggests to us the nature of their office and its significance for the church. They are the representatives and vicegerents of Christ; the bearers and infallible organs of the Holy Ghost; the founders and pillars of the whole church.¹ The fact that Peter calls himself a "fellow elder,"² by no means proves that the apostles were merely presbyters, and therefore congregational officers, any more than the address of the Roman general to his soldiers as "commilitones" shows that they were both of the same rank. The apostles were, indeed, deacons and bishops; but they were also much more. Their office looked, and through their writings still looks, both in doctrine and in discipline, to all Christendom. After the Lord withdrew His visible presence from the world, they formed the highest tribunal of appeal, the supreme, all-sufficient authority, as the inspired interpreters of the divine economy of salvation; and to this day their writings, those records of the Christian revelation in its primitive purity and freshness, remain the infallible rule of faith and practice. So far as doctrine is concerned, the apostles could challenge for their teaching unconditional obedience; for the Spirit of God gave them mouth and wisdom, and spoke through them in an infallible manner;³ and it is not at all to be imagined that they suffered themselves here to be corrected or interfered with in any point by the congregations, which in fact owed to them their very existence. Their writings are addressed in the first instance, indeed, to particular churches or persons, but through these also to all Christians in all ages. As to church government and discipline, they had the oversight and care of all the churches, as Paul himself distinctly says (2 Cor. xi. 28, 29): "Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches. Who is weak, and I am not weak (by sympathy and common interest)? Who is offended, and I burn

otherwise unknown to us (some, as Chrysostom and Grotius, take Ἰουνίαν for the accus. of Ἰουνία, and understand by it the wife of Andronicus), that they were ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, it is to be referred to the good credit in which they stood *with* the (proper) apostles. So Beza, Grotius, Meyer, and others of the best commentators.

¹ Comp. such passages as Matth. xvi. 18, *et seq.*; xviii. 18. John xx. 22, *et seq.*; xiv. 26; xvi. 13. Acts i. 5; ii. 4. 2 Cor. v. 20. Eph. ii. 20. Gal. ii. 9. Rev. xxi. 14.

² συμπερισβύτερος, 1 Pet. v. 1. Comp. 2 John 1, and 3 John 1.

³ Matth. x. 19, *et seq.* Mark xiii. 11. Luke xii. 11, *et seq.*; xxi. 15.

not?" When Peter calls himself co-presbyter, he implies also that, though absent in the body, he still took part in the government of the several congregations, to which he wrote (1 Peter v. 1). The nature of the case required, indeed, that the apostles in their missionary work should take different parts of the vast field. Paul made it his rule to labour in regions where none of his colleagues had yet preached the gospel (Rom. xv. 20, *et seq.*; 2 Cor. x. 13-16); and according to the agreement made at the apostolic council, A.D. 50, he and Barnabas gave themselves chiefly to the Gentiles; while James, Peter, and John went to the Jews.¹ But this destroyed not the rightful official relation of each to the entire field. For in every city Paul addressed himself first to the Jews; Peter wrote to Paul's churches in Asia Minor, which consisted mostly of Gentile Christians;² both met at last, according to unanimous tradition, in Rome, where they doubtless exercised joint oversight; and after their death John entered into the labours of Paul in Asia Minor.

In virtue of this universal vocation, the apostles were not only evangelists for the whole unconverted world (Matth. xxviii. 20), but at the same time the living bonds and the personal representatives of the inward and outward unity of the churches already organized.³ The council at Jerusalem, already so often noticed, is the most perfect outward exhibition of the unity of the apostolic church, and at the same time a sanction by primitive Christianity of the *synodical* form of government, in which all orders of the church are represented, to transact business and discuss questions of general concern, and to give final decisions.

With all this comprehensive authority, however, with all their personal independence in their respective spheres, by virtue of which Paul, for example, once even rebuked the distinguished apostle, Peter, much his senior in office,⁴ the apostles still regarded themselves always as a collegiate body, and exercised their power as organic members of such a body and under a sense of

¹ Gal. ii. 7-9. This fact perhaps gave rise to the old story, that the apostles at Jerusalem divided themselves among the different countries of the earth. Comp. Socrates: *Hist. Eccl.* I. 19. Rufinus: *H. E.* I. 9, and Theodoret, *ad Ps.* 116.

² Comp. § 91 above.

³ Comp. Rom. xvi. 16: "The churches of Christ salute you." 1 Cor. xvi. 19: "The churches of Asia salute you." Ver. 20: "All the brethren greet you." Heb. xiii. 24, etc.

⁴ Comp. § 70.

responsibility to it. They did not stand apart, but blended their several gifts and peculiarities into a complete, harmonious whole. And as they were thus united with one another, so were they united also with the church, whose unity they personally represented. We have already seen (§ 128), that, with all the authority committed to them immediately by Christ, they never forced any measure upon the churches, but administered the government in active sympathy with them, and by their full consent. Hence the summoning of the council in the great controversy respecting the admission of the Gentiles to the church, that the decision might proceed from the whole body. They demanded no acknowledgment of their authority, which did not rest in free conviction and love on the part of the people; no obedience to their orders, which did not spring from the actual experience of the power of divine truth in the hearts of the people themselves. From all tyranny over conscience, from all arbitrary hierarchical despotism, they were infinitely removed. They regarded the object of the church as one to be attained, not by some governing and others being governed, but by the active co-operation and mutual fraternal assistance of all under the common Head, the Redeemer of the whole body (Eph. iv.; 1 Cor. xii.) In feeding the flock they had the highest regard to the rights, freedom, and dignity of the humblest soul committed to their care. In every believer, even in a poor slave like Onesimus, they recognized a member of the same body and a beloved brother in Christ. In the whole company of saints they saw a family of free children of God, a holy people and a royal priesthood, to show forth the praises of Him who had called them out of darkness into His marvellous light (1 Peter ii. 5, 9).

With the destination of the apostles for the whole church is connected also their mode of life. They did not station themselves at any fixed point, nor confine themselves to a particular diocese, but spent almost all their time in tours of missionary labour and of visitation. The only exception to this was the case of James the Just, who, for all that we know of him,¹ made the theocratic capital his permanent residence; and for this reason was almost always styled in the ancient church from the

¹ Comp. Acts xii. 17; xv. 13-21; xxi. 18.

time of Clemens Alexandrinus, the first *bishop* of Jerusalem.¹ Yet this does not require us to place him precisely in the same category with the proper bishops of a later day. He stood in the mother church as the representative of the apostolic college, and acted in its name.² On him devolved, as it seems, after the apostolic council, the superintendence of all the Jewish-Christian churches in Palestine and the surrounding countries; and his epistle, accordingly, is addressed to all believing Israelites.

NOTE.—The discussion of the interesting question lately renewed by the modern Montanists, the English sect of *Irvingites* (which has recently spread also in Germany and the United States), concerning the continuance or revival of the apostolical office, does not properly fall within this historical sketch, and the subject can, therefore, be but briefly touched upon here by way of appendix. We may apply to this case, what we have said above (§ 116) on the perpetuity of the charisms. For gifts and offices are closely connected, like soul and body. Here, as there, we must distinguish between form and essence. The apostles occupy in several respects a position altogether peculiar, in which none can rival or supplant them, first, as called by Christ *in person*, without human intervention; secondly, as the *inspired* and *infallible* bearers of the Christian revelation; thirdly, as the *founders* of the church; and fourthly, as the *representatives* not only of the Jews, or of the church of their day, but of *all* Christendom. As the Lord himself called only twelve, and promised them, that they should hereafter sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matth. xix. 28); so also the last book of the Bible knows of but “twelve apostles of the Lamb,” whose names are written on the twelve foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 14; comp. xii. 1, the twelve stars on the crown of Christ’s bride). Under these aspects their office is intransmissible. Accordingly we find that the number was not replenished after the death of any one (as the elder James, for instance, Acts xi. 2); and during the last ten years of the first century John was the only surviving member of the original college.—On the other hand,

¹ See the quotations from the fathers in R. Rothe, l. c. p. 264, *et seq.* Indeed, this very position of James, in contrast with the missionary life of the apostles generally, is one of the arguments against his identity with the younger apostle of this name, and in favour of considering him merely an apostolical man (like Barnabas), whose great credit rested partly on his own character and partly on his relationship to the Lord. Comp. § 95, and the monograph on this subject there referred to.

² See Rothe, p. 267, *et seq.*, and the statement of Hegesippus in *Euseb.* II. 23, at the beginning of which it is said of James: διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων; which we are not to translate with Jerome “*post Apostolos*,” but “*in connection with the apostles*.” Hegesippus does not call James himself bishop, but applies this title to James’ successor, Simeon, the son of Cleopas and kinsman of Jesus, in *Euseb.* IV. 22: μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον . . . Σομεῶν . . . καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος, ὃν προέθιντο πάντες, ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον.

however, we may very properly speak of an *unbroken continuation* of the apostolate. For, in the first place, the *apostles* originally appointed by our Lord *still live* and *work*, not only personally in the church above, which stands in mystical union with the church below, but also, through their normative *word* and their *spirit*, in the church militant itself, every day and every hour teaching, encouraging, exhorting, strengthening, and comforting. Then secondly, *every regularly called minister* (and not the bishops alone, according to the Catholic and Anglican doctrine), is, as to the essential character of his office, in the wide sense a *successor* of the apostles; since he also stands as an ambassador in Christ's stead, and in His name and as His organ administers to penitent sinners all the benefits of redemption through the word and sacraments, which are to this day a savour of life unto life or of death unto death. For though much that is human and worldly has crept into the whole administration of the church, yet, in the language of the pious Rieger, "the blessed God is still as earnest in upholding the gospel of his Son at this day, as He was when it was first preached; and therefore men may still rejoice as much as they might at first in the institution of the ministerial office; in the call to it, the qualifications for it, and the blessings of it." Finally, as we find even in the beginning *apostolical* men, such as Barnabas and James the Just, along with the proper apostles and bearing their name, at least in its wider sense; so the Lord of the church continues to send, from time to time, altogether extraordinary instruments, in the persons of great *national missionaries* and genial *reformers*, who exercise over a large part of the Christian world, if not over the whole, a kind of apostolical influence, and enjoy a corresponding distinction. We may say in general, that almost all the epoch-forming movements in history proceed from highly gifted, influential individuals, in whom a great idea assumes flesh and blood, and presents itself to the age in concrete and, as it were, palpable life and freshness. That our own age too needs some such heroes in religion, to remedy, theoretically and practically, the disorders of the church as it now stands, and by some creative act to prepare the way for the second coming of Christ, and thus to introduce the church of the future, we are firmly convinced; and we hold it to be the duty of Christians to pray, that the Lord would raise up such instruments, and fit them for the work. But that they have already appeared in the so-called Irvingite "apostles" we must be allowed, with all respect for the honesty and earnestness of their efforts, to hold in great doubt, even after perusing the apostle Carlyle's tract on the Apostolic Office, which Dr H. Thiersch has translated into German. The Lord has never forsaken his church, nor left himself without a witness in it. Just so far as one gives up the reasonableness of history, he denies also the precious fundamental truths of the universal providence of God and of the perpetual and real presence of Christ in the church, which is "His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

§ 130. *Prophets.*

The second class of officers, named immediately after the apostles, in Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5; iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28, *et seq.*, are the *prophets*. By this term we are to understand inspired teachers and enthusiastic preachers of divine mysteries.¹ They were not confined to any particular place, but appeared in the different churches, teaching, exhorting, and encouraging, as they were moved by the higher impulse of the Spirit. They seem also to have exercised a special influence in the election of officers, by directing attention to those persons, whom the voice of Revelation in connection with prayer and fasting pointed out as superior instruments for spreading the Gospel, or for any other service in the kingdom of God.² Among the prophets the book of Acts incidentally names Agabas, who meets us first at Antioch (xi. 28), afterwards in Cæsarea (xxi. 10); the missionary Barnabas (comp. iv. 36); Simeon, Lucius (not to be confounded with Luke), Manaen, and Saul (the apostle), at Antioch (xiii. 1); Judas, and the Evangelist, Silas, known as Paul's companion (xv. 32). But first of all, the apostles themselves are to be considered prophets. When it is said of Christians (Eph. ii. 20), that they are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν), the omission of the article before the second substantive shows that the two ideas, as in the parallel passage, iii. 5, must be closely joined together, so as to mean the apostles, who are at the same time prophets.³ For the apostles, in fact, as organs of the Holy Ghost, as receivers of the Christian revelation (comp. Gal. i. 12), proclaimed the whole plan of salvation, and disclosed what was before a mystery. And in this view their words and their writings were, in a higher sense than the Old Testament Scriptures, prophetic.⁴

¹ Comp. above, § 117, where we have already spoken of the *gift* of prophecy.

² Acts xiii. 1, *et seq.*; xvi. 2. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 18; iv. 14.

³ To make it refer to the Old Testament prophets is utterly inadmissible. The order of the terms itself is against this; but chiefly the parallel passages, Eph. iv. 11, and iii. 5, where the ὡς ἢ ἡ ἀπεκαλύφθη shuts us up to the New Testament revelation. Comp. also Stier's exposition of the passage, *Comment. I.*, p. 384, *et seq.*

⁴ Comp. Rom. xvi. 26. 2 Peter i. 19; iii. 15, 16, and Stier's remarks, l. c. p. 389, *et seq.*

§ 131. *Evangelists.*

The third rank is assigned by Paul (Eph. iv. 11) to the *evangelists* or itinerant missionaries.¹ The name itself indicates, that their chief business was to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation; primarily among nations yet unconverted; but not exclusively: for believers also need to have the Gospel repeatedly presented to them anew. The discourses of the evangelists were, therefore, historical in their matter, and turned chiefly upon the main facts of the Saviour's life, especially His resurrection.² This easily gave rise to the later application of the term to the authors of our written Gospels. We find the evangelists commonly in the immediate neighbourhood, or at least in the service, of the apostles, as their "helpers" and "fellow-labourers."³ They were most needed by Paul in his extended sphere of labour; and on his last journey to Jerusalem he had with him no less than seven such attendants (Acts xx. 4, 5). To this class of church officers belong Philip, originally one of the seven deacons of Jerusalem, but afterwards promoted to a wider sphere of activity, in which he appears first preaching the Messiah to the Samaritans, then baptizing the Ethiopian on the way from Jerusalem to Gaza, and finally labouring in Cæsarea;⁴ Timothy (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 5: ἔργον ποιήσον εὐαγγελιστοῦ), whom Paul specially loves, and whom he names along with himself in the superscriptions of several of his epistles; Titus, a Gentile convert, perhaps a native of Corinth;⁵ Silas, or Silvanus, a prophet of the church of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22, 32), who accompanied the apostle of the Gentiles

¹ So Theodoret: ἐκείνοι περιιόντες ἐκήρυτταν. Comp. also Neander I. p. 258. The present use of the term is too limited.

² On Eph. iv. 11, Bengel well remarks: "Propheta de *futuris* (but not exclusively), evangelista de *praeteritis* infallibiliter testatur; propheta totum habet a spiritu, evangelista rem visu et auditu pereceptam memoriae prodit, charismate tamen majori ad munus maximi momenti instructus, quam pastores et doctores."

³ Συνεργοί, συνδοῦλοι, κοινωνοί, Phil. iv. 3. Col. i. 7. 2 Cor. viii. 23. Hence Calvin (*Inst.* IV., 3. § 4) describes the evangelists as those, "qui quum dignitate essent apostolis minores, officiotamen proximi erant adeoque vicee eorum gerebant, quales fuerant Lucas, Timotheus, Titus et reliqui similes, ac fortassis etiam septuaginta discipuli, quos secundo ab apostolis loco Christus designavit (Lue. x. 1)."

⁴ Acts viii. 5, *et seq.*; xxvi., *et seq.*; xxi. 8, where he is called "evangelist."

⁵ Gal. ii. 1. 2 Cor. viii. 23; vii. 6, 14; xii. 18. Titus i. 5.

on his second missionary tour,¹ and appears finally in the vicinity of Peter (1 Peter v. 12); Luke, the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles (in which he does, indeed, not mention his name expressly, but includes himself, where he speaks in the first person plural), who was also a physician (Col. iv. 14), and one of Paul's most faithful companions, not forsaking him even in his last imprisonment (Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11); John Mark of Jerusalem, missionary assistant of Paul, then of his uncle Barnabas, afterwards again in company with Paul, and finally (perhaps also at times before) with Peter, to whom he probably owed his conversion, and whom he served as interpreter;² Clement (Phil. iv. 3); Epaphras, founder of the Colossian and other churches in Phrygia, whom we meet at last with his imprisoned teacher in Rome (Col. i. 7; iv. 12, 13); Epaphroditus, the delegate of the Philippians, whom some commentators groundlessly take to be the same as Epaphras (Phil. ii. 25); perhaps also Tychicus (Titus iii. 12); Trophimus, Demas, Apollos, and other co-labourers of the apostles.³

These examples suffice to show that the evangelists also were not *congregational* officers,⁴ nor stationed like the presbyters and later bishops at particular posts, but that they travelled about freely wherever their services were needed. The apostles employed them as messengers for various purposes to all points of

¹ Acts xv. 40; xvi. 19, 25; xvii. 4; xviii. 5. 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 1, where he is put before Timothy, probably as being older.

² Acts xii. 25; xiii. 5, 13; xv. 39. Col. iv. 10. Philem. 24. 2 Tim. iv. 11. 1 Peter v. 13.

³ Several of these men are, in the later tradition, made bishops. To Timothy is assigned, as a diocese, Ephesus; to Titus, Crete (in the *Const. apost.* VII. 46, by Euseb. *II. E.* III. 4, Jerome *catal. sub Tim. and Tit.*, and others); to Epaphroditus, Philippi (by Theodoret on Phil. i. 1, and ii. 25, on account of the title *ἀπόστολος*), to Apollos, Cæsarea (*Menolog. Graec.* II. p. 17); to Tychicus, Chalcedon; and Paul's *συνεργός* Clement, is generally held to be the same as the well-known Roman bishop of that name. But, the last case out of view, some of these traditions can with great difficulty be reconciled with New Testament facts. Timothy, for example, down to the last imprisonment of Paul, had no fixed residence; and after Paul's death, it was John rather who presided over the church at Ephesus. That Titus had no local attachment to Crete appears from 2 Cor. *passim* and from Titus iii. 13. The later system of church government exhibits no exact parallel to the offices here in question.

⁴ According to the distinction made above (§ 125) between these and church officers. This distinction is entirely overlooked by the author of the articles: "*The apostleship a temporary office*, in the "Princeton Review" for 1849 and 1850, which make Timothy and Titus to have been no more than common presbyters.

their vast field;¹ sending them, now for the further propagation of the Gospel; now to carry letters; now to visit, inspect, and strengthen congregations already established; so that the evangelists also, like the apostles themselves, served as living bonds of union and promoters of fraternal harmony among the different sections of the church. In short, they were, in some sense, the vicegerents of the apostles, acting under their direction and by their authority, like the commissioners of a king. Thus we find Timothy soon after his conversion in the missionary service (Acts xvi. 3, *et seq.*); then at Ephesus, to complete the organization of the church and repress the growth of errors during the absence of Paul (1 Tim. i. 3; iii. 14, 15; iv. 13). Afterwards he is sent by Paul to Corinth (Acts xix. 22; 1 Cor. iv. 17, *et seq.*; xvi. 10); falls in with him again in Macedonia (2 Cor. i. 1); accompanies the apostle on his last journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4); is with him in his confinement at Rome (Col. i. 1; Philem. 1; Phil. i. 1); goes as a delegate with an epistle to the church at Philippi, to inquire into its state (Phil. ii. 19–23); must have been, when Paul wrote his second epistle to him, in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, whence he is summoned by the apostle, shortly before the latter's death, to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 9, 21); and finally the epistle to the Hebrews informs us of his liberation from prison and his intention to travel east (xiii. 23). So with Titus, whom we meet at one time in Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1), at another in Ephesus, at another in Corinth (2 Cor. vii. 6, 14), again in Crete (Tit. i. 5), then in Nicopolis (Tit. iii. 12), and finally in Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10).

¹ Hence Rothe (p. 305) not improperly styles them *apostolical delegates*. We prefer, however, the title evangelists, as it is used by Paul himself.

CHAPTER III.

CONGREGATIONAL OFFICES.

§ 132. *Presbyter-Bishops.*

AFTER these three offices, which relate to the whole church, the apostle mentions, Eph. iv. 11, *pastors and teachers*; denoting by these terms the regular overseers of *single congregations*, in their twofold capacity.¹ These officers are undoubtedly the same with those elsewhere in the New Testament commonly called presbyters, and four times bishops (viz., in Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7), whose business is expressly declared to be the feeding of the flock.²

First, as to the meaning of these terms and their relation to one another. The name *presbyter*, or *elder*, is no doubt of Jewish-Christian origin,—a translation of the Hebrew title *saken*, *sekenim* (שֵׁנִים), applied to the rulers of the synagogues, on whom devolved the conduct of religious affairs. It refers, therefore, primarily to age and the personal venerableness, which goes with it;³ then derivatively to official dignity and authority, since

¹ That the words *ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*, Eph. iv. 11, on account of the absence of *τοὺς δέ*, must be referred to one and the same office, as is done by Jerome and Augustine, and most modern commentators, Rückert, Harless, Meyer, Stier (Calvin, however, Beza and De Wette dissenting), we have before remarked (§ 125). Their restriction to a small sphere is noticed already by Theodoret when he speaks of them as *τοὺς κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην ἀφωρισμένους*. There is also, it is true, a pastorate and doctorate for the whole church; but this belongs to the apostles, who, as before observed, united all offices in themselves. (The distinction of pastors and teachers as two separate officers, which is made in several Calvinistic church constitutions, for instance in the Book of Discipline of the Scotch Kirk, however good it may be in itself, cannot be based upon Eph. iv. 11, as was first done by Calvin).

² *Ποιμαίνειν*, Acts xx. 28, so also 1 Peter v. 1, 2. Comp. also the close collocation of *ποιμήν* and *ἐπίσκοπος*, 1 Peter ii. 25, where both terms are applied to Christ.

³ It would seem to be in this sense, and not in the official, that John styles himself “the elder,” or presbyter, 2 John 1, and 3 John 1. Even in the second and third

these are usually borne by men of age and experience.¹ The term *bishop*, or *overseer*, is, in all probability, borrowed from the political relations of the Greeks.² Hence it came later into ecclesiastical use, and made its first appearance too among the Gentile Christians; as in fact it occurs in the New Testament, only in the writings of Paul and his disciple, Luke. It refers, as the term itself signifies, to the official duty and activity of these congregational rulers.³

But aside from this immaterial difference in origin and signification, the two appellations belong to *one and the same office*; so that the bishops of the New Testament are to be regarded not as diocesan bishops like those of a later period, but simply as congregational officers. This is placed beyond question by every passage in which we meet with this title. For in Acts xx. 28, Paul addresses as “bishops” the very same rulers of the Ephesian church, who had just before (ver. 17) been called “presbyters.” Again, in the superscription of his epistle to the Philippians (i. 1) he salutes the saints in Philippi, “with the bishops and deacons (σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις), without mentioning the presbyters,” which can be explained only by supposing the latter to have been identical with the bishops. And then the plural form here used is, as was observed already by Jerome, further evidence of the same fact; since there cannot be more than one bishop, in the

centuries the name *πρεσβύτεροι* is still met with in what may be termed the school of St John, as an honorary title of the earlier church teachers (the ancients, the fathers), even where they were proper bishops in the catholic sense. Comp. § 106 and 107 above, and the quotations from Irenæus in Rothe, p. 414, *et seq.*

¹ Precisely so with the Greek *γεγονυσία*, and the Latin *senatus*, official titles of magistrates derived from age and dignity.

² The delegates appointed to organize states dependent on Athens, as also other persons in authority, were called *episcopoi*; comp. Suidas, s. v. *ἐπίσκοπος*, *Scholia on Aristophanes, Aves* v. 1023. Cicero also uses the word in a letter to Atticus (*Ep.* VII. 11): “Vult me Pompejus esse, quem tota hæc Campana et maritima ora habeat *ἐπίσκοπον*, ad quem delectus et summa negotii referatur;” and in a somewhat different sense the old Roman jurist, Arcadius Charisius, in a fragment of his work *De muneribus civilibus* (*Digest.* lib. IV. Tit. 4, leg. 18, § 7), where it is said: “Episcopi, qui praesunt pani et caeteris venalibus rebus, quae civitatum populis ad quotidianum victum usui sunt.” The terms *ἐπίσκοπος* and *ἐπισκοπή*, moreover, occur several times in the LXX., as the translation of *רָבָה*, *רָבָה*, and *רָבָה*, Num. iv. 16; xxxi. 14. Judges ix. 28. 2 Kings xi. 16. Neh. xi. 9, 14. Isa. lx. 17.

³ Substantially the same distinction was perceived by Jerome, *Epist.* 82, *ad Oceanum*: “Apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri, quia illud nomen *dignitatis* (he says more properly, on Tit. i. 7, nomen *officii*) est, hoc *aetatis*.”

later sense of the term, in any one church. A third proof we have in the *usus loquendi* of the Pastoral Epistles. In Titus i. 5, the apostle directs his disciple to ordain “presbyters” in the churches of Crete; then, speaking of the qualifications to be regarded in the choice, he suddenly brings in the name “bishop,” while, as is shown at once by the causative particle “for” (ver. 7, *δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*, etc.), he is still plainly speaking of the same persons. In 1 Tim. iii. 1–7 he sets forth the requisites for the episcopate, and then (verses 8–13) passes immediately to those for the diaconate, without mentioning the presbyterate either here or afterwards. Yet it is evidently his intention to instruct Timothy respecting the qualifications for *all* the congregational offices; hence the offices of bishop and presbyter must have been the same. Finally; Peter (1 Ep. v. 1, 2) addresses himself to the “presbyters” of the congregations, to which he wrote (and not the bishops, as he must have done in this connection, had they been a higher class of officers), as “also an elder,” a “co-presbyter,” and describes it as their business to “feed the flock of God” and “take the oversight of it” (*ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες, κ. τ. λ.*);—a clear proof, that here also the presbyterate and episcopate coincide; the former term denoting the honour and dignity, the latter the duty, belonging to one and the same office.¹

This identity of presbyters and bishops in the apostolic church was also acknowledged by the most learned church fathers, on exegetical grounds, even after the Catholic episcopal system (which was supposed to have originated in the *apostolate*) had become completely established.²

¹ The same form of expression we find in the apostolic father, Clement of Rome, when he says in his first epistle to the Corinthians, ch. 42, that the apostles ordained the first fruits (*τὰς ἀπαρχάς*) of the Christian faith in new congregations, as *ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*, without mentioning *πρεσβύτεροι* at all. He chose the other term, which is here evidently synonymous, because he had in his eye the passage, Isaiah lx. 17, where the LXX. translate: *καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἀρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.*

² See Rothe, l. c. p. 207–217, where the passages from the fathers are given at large; also Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I. 1, § 30, note 1 (p. 115, *et seq.*, of the 4th ed.) We confine ourselves to the most important, and add some English authorities. Jerome says, *Ad Tit.* i. 7: “Idem est ergo presbyter qui episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent . . . communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur.” Then he adduces as proof all the passages of Scripture noticed above. Again, *Epist.* 85, *ad Evagrium* (in later editions *ad Evangelum*):

As to the time and manner of the introduction of this office we have, unfortunately, no such information as is given respecting the diaconate (Acts vi.) The demand for the office unquestionably arose very early; since, notwithstanding the diffusion of gifts, which were not necessarily confined to official station, provision had to be made for the regular instruction and government of the rapidly multiplying churches. The historical pattern for it was presented in the Jewish Synagogue, in the college or bench of elders (πρεσβύτεροι, Luke vii. 3; ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, Mark v.

“Nam quum apostolus perspieue doceat, eosdem esse presbyteros et episcopos,” etc. Finally, *Ep.* 82, *ad Oceanum* (al. 83): “In utraque epistola (the first to Timothy and the one to Titus) sive episcopi sive presbyteri (quamquam apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri fuerint, quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc aetatis) jubentur monogami in elerum eligi.” So Ambrosiaster, *ad Eph.* iv. 11, and the author of the pseudo-Augustinian *Quaestiones V. et N. T.* qu. 101. Among the Greek fathers, Chrysostom, *Hom.* I. in *Ep. ad Philipp.*, says: Συνεπισκόποις (so he reads Phil. i. 1, instead of σὺν ἐπισκόποις) καὶ διακόνις. τί τοῦτο: μιᾷς πόλεως πολλοὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἦσαν; Οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλὰ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους οὕτως ἐκάλεσε· τότε γὰρ τέως ἐκοινώνουν τοῖς ὀνόμασι, καὶ διάκονος ὁ ἐπίσκοτος ἐλεγετο, κ. τ. λ. Still plainer is the language of Theodoret, *ad Phil.* i. 1: . . . ἐπισκόπους δὲ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καλεῖ, ἀμφότερα γὰρ εἶχον κατ’ἐκείνον τὸν καιρὸν τὰ ὀνόματα. for which he quotes the proof texts already given. So *ad* 1 Tim. iii. 1: ἐπίσκοπον δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν πρεσβύτερον λέγει, κ. τ. λ. This view was maintained even still later by theologians of the Middle Ages, one of whom, Pope Urban II. (1091), expressed himself in a remarkable way: “Sacros antem ordines dicimus diaconatum et presbyteratum. Hos siquidem solos primitiva legitur ecclesia habuisse: super his solum praeceptum habemus apostoli.” Among the modern Roman Catholic expositors, Mack (*Commentar über die Pastoralbriefe des Ap. Paulus*, Tüb. 1836, p. 60, *et seq.*) fully concedes the identity of the New Testament presbyters and bishops; he sees in them the later presbyters, and takes the later bishops, on the contrary, as the successors of the apostles, and their immediate assistants. This is undoubtedly, on Catholic ground, the only proper derivation of the episcopate. By Protestant interpreters and historians this identity has always been asserted, and that too by several learned Episcopalians. Dr Whitby, for instance, on Phil. i. 1, admits,—“Both the Greek and Latin Fathers do, with one consent, declare that Bishops were called Presbyters, and Presbyters Bishops, in apostolic times, the names being then common.” Also, to quote a recent critical authority, Dr Bloomfield, on Acts xx. 17 (*Greek Test. with English Notes*, etc. vol. i. p. 560, Philad. ed.), remarks on the term πρεσβυτέρους: As these persons are at ver. 28 called ἐπισκόπους, and especially from a comparison of other passages (as 1 Tim. iii. 1), the best Commentators, ancient and modern, have with reason inferred that the terms as yet denoted the same thing;” though he adds immediately, but without proof, that one of the presbyters was set over the rest as a bishop in the modern sense. The same view is expressed in Conybeare and Howson’s work on St Paul, I. p. 465. When some Anglican divines deny the original identity of presbyters and bishops, and pretend to derive their system of church government from the name and office of the *New Testament* bishop, they can be, indeed, easily refuted. But this by no means settles the question of church polity. The Episcopal and Presbyterian controversy turns ultimately on the decision of the question, whether the office of the *apostles* and their *delegates* has a *permanent* or merely a *temporary* character.

22. Acts xiii. 15), who conducted the exercises of public worship, prayer and the reading and exposition of the Scriptures. Christian presbyters meet us for the first time, Acts xi. 30, at Jerusalem, when the church of Antioch sent a collection to their brethren in Judea. Thence the institution passed over not only to all the Jewish-Christian churches, but also to those planted by Paul and his co-labourers among the Gentiles. From the example of the family of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 15) we learn, that the first converts (the ἀπαρχαί) were usually chosen to this office; a fact explicitly confirmed also by Clement of Rome.¹

After the pattern of the synagogues, as well as the ancient municipal governments, where the power was vested, aristocratically, in a senate or college of *decuriones*, every church had a number of presbyters. They appear everywhere in the plural, and as a corporate body; at Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30; xv. 4, 6, 23; xxi. 18; at Ephesus, xx. 17, 28; at Philippi, Phil. i. 1; at the ordination of Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 14, where mention is made of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery; and in the churches, to which James wrote, Jas. v. 14; "Is any sick among you; let him call for *the presbyters of the congregation*, and let them pray over him," etc. The same is implied also in the statement (Acts xiv. 23), that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders (several, of course) for *every* church; and still more clearly in the direction given to Titus (Titus i. 5), to ordain elders, that is a presbytery, in *every* city of Crete.²

Some scholars have imagined, indeed, that in the larger cities there were several churches, with only one presbyter or bishop to each; that, consequently, the government of congregations was from the first in principle, not democratic, nor aristocratic, but monarchical.³ But this atomic theory of a multitude of

¹ In the passage already quoted, 1 Cor. ch. 42.

² "Ἰνα . . . καταστήσης κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους. Dr Baur, indeed (in his work against the genuineness of Paul's Pastoral Epistles, Stuttg. and Tübingen. 1835, p. 81), takes the plural to refer to the collective idea implied in κατὰ πόλιν, so that Titus was to place only one presbyter in each city. But in this case we should expect either κατὰ πόλεις or πρεσβύτερον. The κατὰ πόλιν is more adverbial than collective, equivalent to *oppidatim*, by cities. So with κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, Acts xiv. 23. Comp. Rothe, l. c. p. 181, *et seq.*

³ So Baur, l. c.; and in a somewhat different form the Low Dutch theologian, Kist, in his article on the Origin of Episcopacy (Utrecht. 1830), translated in Illgen's "Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie," vol. ii. No. 2, p. 46-90.

independent churches is refuted by the passages just quoted, in which the presbyters appear as a college; and by the tendency towards organized association, which entered into the very life of Christians from the beginning. The *household* churches (ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον), frequently mentioned and greeted,¹ indicate merely the fact, that the Christians, where they had become very numerous and lived far apart, as in Rome particularly (the population of which then exceeded that of Paris now), were accustomed to meet for edification at different places. Such an arrangement was perfectly consistent with the organic union of these congregations as one whole, under the superintendence of a common presbytery. Hence, also, the apostolical epistles are never addressed to a separate part of the congregation, an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, a conventicle, but always to the whole body of Christians at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, etc., as one moral person.²

Whether now a perfect parity reigned among these collegiate presbyters; or one, say the oldest, constantly presided over the rest; or, finally, one followed another in the presidency, as *primus inter pares*, by some kind of rotation, the New Testament gives us no information, unless we find it in the apocalyptic angels, of whom we shall speak more particularly hereafter. The analogy of the Jewish synagogues leads to no certain result, since it is disputed whether there was a particular presidency, an office of *archi-synagogos* properly so-called, in these as early as the time of Christ.³ Respecting the Roman municipal system,

¹ Rom. xvi. 4, 5, 14, 15. 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Col. iv. 15. Philem. ii.

² Comp. 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 1. 1 Cor. i. 2.; v. 1, *et seq.* 2 Cor. i. 1, 23; ii. 1, *et seq.* Col. iv. 16. Phil. i. 1, etc. Even Neander, otherwise comparatively so unchurchly, well observes against Kist and Baur (*Kirchengesch.* I. p. 317, 2d ed.): "This unity presents itself not as something yet to arise, but as something original, grounded from the first in the very nature of the Christian consciousness; and the divisions, which threaten to destroy it, appear rather as a sickly growth of after times, as in the Corinthian church. If also separate assemblies of some portions of the community may have been formed in the private houses of those who had a suitable room for them, or were specially qualified to edify them by their discourses, this itself was a result of the enlargement of the church, which was already regularly organized; and those, who formed such meetings, did *not* thereby separate themselves from the great whole of the church under its ruling senate." Comp. also Neander's *Gesch. d. Pflanzung*, etc., p. 55 and p. 253, Note.

³ As Vitranga, for example (*De synag. vet.* II. 9-11), and Winer (*Reallexikon*, II. p. 550), suppose. But the only passage, where one is directly named ἀρχισυνάγωγος

on the contrary, we know, that in the senates of the cities out of Italy one of the decuriones, the eldest, acted as president under the title *principalis*.¹ Some sort of presidency is certainly indispensable in a well-organized government and in the regular transaction of business, and thus must be presumed to have existed in these primitive presbyteries. But as neither the Acts of the Apostles, nor Paul's, nor the catholic epistles, give us any information respecting it, we have no means of determining its particular form.² In the nature of the case also the presbyters must have distributed the various duties of their office among themselves, so as to avoid promiscuous interference and confusion.

§ 133. *Office of the Episcopal Presbyters.*

If now we inquire as to the proper official character of the presbyters, we cannot make them the same with the later diocesan bishops. These last are *church* officers, and claim, justly or unjustly, a position like that of the apostles and their immediate assistants, Timothy, Titus, etc. The idea of episcopacy, too, in the usual sense, is essentially monarchical and excludes a plurality of bishops in one and the same place. The presbyter-bishops were rather, as already remarked, officers of *single* congregations; but within these they had charge of all that pertains to the good order and spiritual prosperity of a religious community. Their office then consisted primarily in the general superintendence of the congregation. This is indicated by the very

(רֹאשׁ הַקְּהָלָה) is Luke xiii. 14. It may very easily be, however, that even then, as was unquestionably the case at a later period, a single person presided over the synagogue in smaller places, instead of a body of rulers; or that Luke means simply the president acting as *primus inter pares* at the time. The last is made probable by the fact, that Luke (ch. viii. 41, comp. ver. 49), names Jairus, without qualification, ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς; while Mark in the parallel passage, v. 22, describes him as εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν. In other passages also, as Acts xiii. 15; xviii. 8, 17, as well as Mark v. 22, several ἀρχισυναγωγοί appear in one and the same synagogue; so that the word is here synonymous with πρεσβύτεροι, except, perhaps, that the former refers to official activity (like ἐπίσκοποι), the latter to official dignity.

¹ See Savigny: *Gesch. des röm. Rechts im Mittelalter*, I. p. 80-83.—In the Italian cities *magistratus* stood at the head of the bodies of decuriones.

² Dr Rothe, l. c. p. 240 and 528, thinks, indeed, that the presbyteries of those days needed no particular president from among themselves, because the apostles and their delegates were their proper presidents. But these could not be present in all the congregations and on every occasion.

names applied to them and their duties; “pastors” (ποιμένες, Eph. iv. 11, answering to the Hebrew מְרִבֵּנִים, as the rulers of the synagogue were also called), who are to “feed” the flock of God (ποιμαίνειν, Acts xx. 28; 1 Peter v. 2); “overseers” (ἐπίσκοποι and ἐπισκοπεῖν, 1 Pet. v. 2, etc.); “rulers” (προϊστάμενοι, προστῆναι, 1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12, προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, 1 Tim. v. 17, comp. κυβερνήσεις, 1 Cor. xii. 28); and “leaders” (ἡγούμενοι, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24). This superintendence of a congregation included not only the direction of public worship and a vigilant regard to the religious interests of the church—in a word, the whole province of pastoral care and discipline,—but also the management of the property and all the pecuniary concerns of the congregation; as may be inferred from the fact, that the collection of the Antiochian Christians for their brethren in Judea was delivered to the presbytery at Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30.

But then, again, the presbyters were at the same time the regular teachers of the congregation, and can therefore not be put in the same class with the lay elders of Presbyterian churches. On them devolved officially the exposition of the Scriptures, the preaching of the gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. That this function was closely connected with the other appears from the very juxta-position of “pastors and teachers,” Eph. iv. 11, where the two terms must be referred to the same person.¹ The same association of ruling and teaching we find in Heb. xiii. 7: “Remember them which have the rule over you (ἡγούμενοι), who have spoken unto you the word of God οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ); whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation;” comp. ver. 17. Particularly decisive, however, are the instructions of the pastoral epistles, where, among the requirements for the office of presbyter, besides irreproachable piety and a talent for the administration of church government, Paul expressly mentions also capacity to teach, 1 Tim. iii. 2: “A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, *apt to teach* (διδασκτικόν),” etc.; so in Tit. i. 9, where it is required of a bishop, that he should “hold fast the

¹ Comp. § 125 above.

faithful word, as he had been taught (ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγον), that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

These passages forbid our making two distinct classes of presbyters, of which one, corresponding to the seniors or lay elders in the Calvinistic churches, had to do only with the government, and not at all with the administration of doctrine and the sacraments; while the other, on the contrary, was devoted entirely, or at least mainly, to the service of the word and altar. Such a distinction of *ruling* elders, belonging to the laity, and *teaching* presbyters, or ministers proper, first suggested by Calvin,¹ and afterwards further insisted on by many Protestant (especially Presbyterian) divines,² rests, indeed, on a very judicious ecclesiastical policy, and is, so far, altogether justifiable; but it cannot be proved at all from the New Testament or church antiquity, and presupposes also an opposition of clergy and laity, which did not exist under the same form in the apostolic period. The only passage appealed to in support of it is 1 Tim. v. 17: "Let the elders, that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, *especially they who labour in the word and doctrine*" (μάλιστα δὲ οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ.) This "especially," we are told, implies, that there were presbyters also, who officially had nothing to do with teaching, and that the teaching presbyters were of higher standing.³ But this conclusion is by no means

¹ *Inst. rel. chr.* IV. 3, § 8: "Gubernatores fuisse existimo seniores ex plebe delectos, qui censuræ morum et exercendæ disciplinæ una cum episcopis præessent."

² Comp., for instance, Dr S. Miller's *Letters Concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry*, 2d ed., Philad., 1830, p. 27, *et seq.*, and the language of English theologians there quoted. But many Lutherans also have zealously maintained the distinction, as J. J. Böhmer and Ziegler; comp. Rothe, p. 222, Note.

³ Thus Dr Owen, for example (quoted by Dr Miller, l. c. p. 28), "This would be a text of uncontrollable evidence, if it had anything but prejudice and interest to contend with. On the first proposal of this text, *that the Elders who rule well are worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in word and doctrine*, a rational man, who is unprejudiced, who never heard of the controversy of ruling Elders, can hardly avoid an apprehension that there are two sorts of Elders, some that labour in the word and doctrine, and some who do not do so. The truth is, it was interest and prejudice that first caused some learned men to strain their wits to find out evasions from the evidence of this testimony: being so found, some others, of meaner abilities, have been entangled by them." On the other hand, there have been distinguished Reformed scholars, even of an earlier day, especially Vitringa (*De synag. vet.* l. II. c. 2 and 3, p. 490-500), who have denied this passage any force in favour of lay elders. Comp. also Mosheim: *Comm. de reb. Christ. a. Const. M.* p. 126, *et seq.*

so sure, as may at first sight appear. For, in the first place, it is questionable, whether the emphasis does not fall rather on *κοπιῶντες*, referring to laborious diligence in teaching, as also on the *καλῶς* in the beginning of the sentence; making the antithesis to be, not that of teaching and non-teaching elders, but that of those who rule well and teach zealously, and those who both rule and teach, indeed, but without any particular earnestness.¹ In this view the passage would tell rather *for* the union of ruling and teaching in the same office. But even according to the other interpretation, it proves, at best, only the fact, that there were presbyters, who did not teach. It by no means shows, that the existence of such presbyters was regular and approved by the apostle; which is here the main point. Nay, unless we would involve Paul in self-contradiction, we must suppose the very opposite. For in 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tit. i. 9 (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 24), he makes aptness to teach an indispensable qualification for the office of bishop without exception. It has been supposed, also, that traces of lay eldership were to be found in the old African church, and from these has been inferred its existence in the apostolic age. But when the relevant documents of the time of the Donatist controversies in the beginning of the fourth century are more carefully examined, it is found, that the “seniores,” or “seniores plebis,” in North Africa were not ecclesiastical officers at all, but civil magistrates of municipal corporations.²

Nor, finally, can we agree with Dr Neander, who from Paul's distinction of the gift of government (*κυβέρνησις*) from that of teaching (*διδασκαλία*), Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28, infers, that the presbyters or bishops in general had, at first, nothing at all to do with instruction *ex officio*, but were mere presidents of the congregations. Teaching, it is supposed, was attached in the beginning to no particular office, but performed by any one who had the proper inward qualification. It was not till the pastoral

¹ So the passage is taken by Dr Rothe, l. c. p. 224: “The apostle would commend to special respect those of the presbyters who are laborious in the duties of their office; and more particularly such as bestow their unwearied diligence mainly on the business of teaching.” The latest commentators on the Pastoral Epistles, Dr Huther (1850) and Wiesinger (1850) also deny that the passage proves the existence of ruling lay elders as distinct from ministers.

² The proof of this is presented by Rothe, l. c. p. 227-239.

epistles were written that the apostle found it advisable, on account of the intrusion of false teachers, to require of presbyters ability to teach.¹ But it is here taken for granted, that the pastoral epistles were not written till after A.D. 62—an opinion, which stands or falls with the extremely doubtful hypothesis of a second imprisonment of the author at Rome.² Then, again, the circumstance, that ruling and teaching are designated as two separate gifts, is no proof, that they did not belong to one and the same office. Paul connects them closely together (Eph. iv. 11): and Neander himself in fact assumes such a union, at least in the latter part of the apostolic period. Finally, there are clear indications, that this union was an original one. The presbyters of Ephesus are exhorted on Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, to guard the purity of doctrine (Acts xxviii. 29–31); and the epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 7) enjoins upon its readers a grateful remembrance of their teaching rulers, who were then dead, and must therefore have belonged to the former generation. The general liberty of teaching amounted by no means to a provision for the *regular* instruction and edification of the churches; and nothing would be more natural, than that the presbyters, as afterwards, so also from the first, should supply this need, and at the same time administer the sacraments, by virtue of their office. Indeed, there were no other congregational officers, of whom this could be expected.

The conclusion from all this is, that the presbyters or bishops of the apostolic period were the regular teachers and pastors, preachers and leaders of the congregations; that it was their office, to conduct all public worship, to take care of souls, to enforce discipline, and to manage the church property. Of course, all had not the same talent; one excelled in teaching, another in pastoral duties, a third in the talent for ruling; and we may readily suppose, that, where there were several of them, they divided the various duties of their calling among themselves, according to endowments, taste, and necessity. This, however, was always regulated by circumstances, and by no means authorizes us to suppose, that there were two different kinds of presbyters, and two separate offices of government and doctrine.

¹ *Apost. Gesch.* p. 259, *et seq.* So also in his *Kirch. Gesch.* I. p. 320, *et seq.*

² *Comp.* on this point § 87.

§ 134. *Deacons.*

Of the origin of the *diaconate* or *office of help*, we have a graphic account in the sixth chapter of Acts. The immediate occasion of its institution was the voluntary community of goods adopted by the Christians of Jerusalem (comp. § 114); and specially, the complaint of the Hellenists, or Greek Jews, that their widows were neglected in the daily distribution of food and alms, in favour of the Jewish Christians, who were born in Palestine and spoke the Aramaic language—a neglect owing either to the fact, that these widows were not known, being foreigners and somewhat backward; or perhaps to some jealousy existing between the proper Hebrews and their brethren from other lands. At first the apostles, who had charge also of the common fund (Acts iv. 35, 37; v. 2), attended to this matter themselves, or employed agents, perhaps the younger members of the congregation (v. 6, 10); and these agents had given cause for the complaint in question. As the church grew, however, it became more and more impracticable for the apostles to attend to these outward concerns without wrong to their proper spiritual work. “It is not reason,” said the twelve (vi. 2), “that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables,” *i.e.* personally superintend the daily love-feasts and the distribution of alms. In order, therefore, to give themselves wholly to prayer and the preaching of the gospel, and to provide against the dissatisfaction just mentioned by a fixed regulation, they proposed the election of seven men, of good repute, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, for this particular service; and these being chosen by the people, the apostles solemnly set them apart by prayer and the laying on of hands. In the Acts, indeed, these officers are styled simply *οἱ ἑπτὰ*, *the seven* (xxi. 8), and not deacons—that is servants or helpers; but that they were such, we know from the terms *διακονία*, *διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, used to describe their office (vi. 1, 2), and from almost universal exegetical tradition.¹ From the Greek names of the persons chosen—Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch—we

¹ The ancient church even considered itself bound in this case to the sacred number seven; and at Rome, for example, as late as the third century, there were only seven deacons, though the number of presbyters amounted to forty.

may infer, though not with absolute certainty, that they were of Grecian descent. The reason for choosing Hellenists would be simply, that the complaint had come from the Hellenists, and the church, in impartial love, was disposed to give them all advantage in the election. Nothing here obliges us to suppose, with some scholars, that Luke in this chapter records only the appointment of deacons for the Hellenistic part of the church, and that these officers had already existed, perhaps from the first, in the Hebrew portion.¹

From Jerusalem this arrangement spread to other churches. For although others did not adopt the community of goods, yet it was necessary everywhere to provide in some regular way for the poor and the sick, as well as for the external services of the sanctuary. It is true, Acts xiv. 23 (comp. Tit. i. 5), speaks only of appointing elders;² but we have express mention of deacons in the churches at Rome (Rom. xii. 7, *εἶτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ*), Philippi (Phil. i. 1), and Corinth; for the existence of a deaconess, Phebe, at Cenchrea (Rom. xvi. 1), certainly leads us to infer that there were deacons there also, and the gift of "helps" (*ἀντιλήψεις*, 1 Cor. xii. 28) must be understood particularly as a qualification for this office (comp. § 119). And generally we must presume, that these officers existed in all the churches planted by Paul, as he gives to Timothy and Titus special instructions in regard to their election and qualifications.

The business of these deacons consisted primarily and mainly,

¹ Mosheim (*Com. de reb. chr.*, etc., p. 114, *et seq.*), Mack (*Commentar über die Pastoralbriefe*, p. 269), Kuinöl, Meyer, and Olshausen (on Acts v. 6, and vi. 1), and also Conybeare and Howson (on the Life and Ep. of St Paul, I. 467), appeal, indeed, in support of this view, to the "young men" mentioned in Acts v. 6, 10 (*οἱ νεώτεροι, οἱ νεανίσκοι*: comp. Luke xxii. 26, where *ὁ νεώτερος* is used as equivalent to *ὁ διακονῶν*), who attended to the removal and burial of the bodies of Ananias and Sapphira. But this is not enough to show that the "young men" were regular church officers, who, in distinction from the elders (*πρεσβύτεροι*), had charge of the outward affairs of the congregation. The service here performed may have been very probably a voluntary one, for which the younger members offered themselves from a natural sense of propriety. Comp. also, against Mosheim, Neander: *Apost. Gesch.* p. 47, *et seq.* and Rothe, p. 163, *et seq.*

² Luke never mentions the deacons, except in Acts vi. 3, and xxi. 8, and here not by this name. But he frequently speaks of the *πρεσβύτεροι* (xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 4; vi. 23; xx. 17; xxi. 18). This suggests the conjecture, that he uses the latter term in a wide sense, including the deacons, and making it the common title of the *ἐπισκοποῦντες* and *διακονοῦντες*. This would leave the less reason for referring *νεώτεροι* to the deacons.

according to the account of their institution, in the *care of the poor and the sick*. This is not inconsistent with the statement in Acts xi. 30, that the money collected at Antioch was delivered to the presbyters at Jerusalem. We must suppose the relation to have been such, that the presbyters were the proper treasurers of the congregation, and that the deacons distributed the contributions under their supervision, and perhaps collected the alms. This external charge, however, naturally came to associate with itself a sort of pastoral care; for poverty and sickness offer the very best opportunities for instruction, exhortation, and consolation, and according to the spirit of Christianity the relief of bodily wants should serve only as a bridge or channel for the communication of the far more precious benefits of the gospel. The helps or ministrations (*ἀντιλήψεις*), counted by the apostle among the spiritual gifts (1 Cor. xii. 28), relate perhaps to the whole compass of these works of charity belonging to the deacons. Hence in the appointment of deacons, men were looked for of strong faith and exemplary piety (Acts vi. 3, comp. v. 8); and Paul (1 Tim. iii. 8, *et seq.*) requires, that deacons be of good report, upright, temperate, free from covetousness (to which their handling of the public fund might be a temptation), and sound and well instructed in the faith. This last specification, again, looks to their participation in the pastoral work and also in the business of *teaching*. That these helpers at this time also preached the gospel, when properly gifted, follows even from the general liberty to teach (comp. § 128); and is besides explicitly confirmed by the example of Stephen, the enlightened forerunner of the great apostle of the Gentiles (Acts vi. 8–10; vii. 1–53; comp. § 58), and of Philip, also one of the seven of Jerusalem (viii. 5, *et seq.*; 26 *et seq.*) It was very natural, that those, who distinguished themselves in this service by their gifts and zeal, should be advanced to higher offices. So Philip, just mentioned, is afterwards called an “evangelist” (xxi. 8); and most expositors refer the passage, 1 Tim. iii. 13, to promotion from the office of deacon to that of presbyter.

From all this it is clear, that the deacons in the apostolic church had a far higher and more spiritual vocation, than the “ministers” of the Jewish synagogues, the *שְׂרָפָיִם*, as they were called (*ὑπηρέται* in Luke iv. 20, comp. John. vii. 32), who opened

and closed the synagogues, kept them clean, and handed out the books for reading. The Christian diaconate cannot be regarded, therefore, as it sometimes is, as a mere imitation of this Jewish office. The two, however, will certainly admit of some comparison; inasmuch as, even from an early time, there might have been added, as it were spontaneously, to the proper duties of the deacons, certain services also, connected with the administration of the sacraments and other parts of public worship. For though this cannot be directly proved from the New Testament, yet it may with tolerable certainty be inferred from the close connection, in those days, between the common love-feasts, of which the deacons had charge (*διακονεῖν τραπέζαις*, Acts vi. 2), and the daily celebration of the Lord's Supper; and from later ecclesiastical usage. Some persons must perform these services, and they evidently fell most naturally to the deacons; only they must not be regarded as their only or principal business.

Thus these officers were living bonds of union between the congregation and its presbyters; taken from the bosom of the community; chosen entirely by the people themselves (comp. § 126); intimately acquainted with their wants; and thus admirably qualified to assist the presbyters with counsel and action in all their official duties.

§ 135. *Deaconesses.*

Besides this class of helpers, we find in the apostolic church the order of female deacons, or *deaconesses*, which was supplementary to the other office, and was kept up in the Greek church down to the thirteenth century. It is commonly regarded as having originated among the Gentile-Christians, where the women lived in greater seclusion, and their intercourse with men was more restricted than among the Jews.¹ But aside from any rules of propriety, the general need required, that for special pastoral service and the care of the poor and the sick, among the female part of the congregation there should be a corresponding office. Here was opened to women, to whom the apostle forbade

¹ So Grotius, on Rom. xvi. 1: "In Judæa Diaconi viri etiam mulieribus ministrare poterant: erat enim ibi liberior ad foeminas aditus quam in Graecia, ubi viris clausa γυναικωνίτις. Ideo duplici in Graecia foeminarum auxilio Ecclesiæ opus habuere," etc. Comp. Rothe, p. 246.

any active part in the public assemblies (comp. § 126), a noble field for the unfolding of their peculiar gifts, for the exercise of their love and devotion, without any departure from their natural and proper sphere. By means of this office they could carry the blessings of the gospel into the most private and delicate relations of domestic life, and, unseen by the world, might quietly and modestly do unspeakable good.—To this care of the widows, of the poor, and of the sick, as in the case of the male deacons, various other services no doubt came to be added, though we have no distinct account of them. Among these we reckon the education of orphans, attention to strangers, the practice of hospitality (comp. 1 Tim. v. 10), and the assistance needed at the baptism of females.

The existence of such deaconesses in the apostolic church is placed beyond doubt by Rom. xvi. 1, where Paul commends to the kind interest of the Roman Christians the sister, Phebe, probably the bearer of the letter, describing her as “a servant of the church which is at Cenchreae” (οὖσαν διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς). In all probability Tryphena, Tryphosa, and Persis, who are praised (ver. 12) for their labour in the Lord, served the Roman church in the same capacity. On the other hand, it is still a question, whether the widows in 1 Tim. v. 9–15 are proper deaconesses;¹ or female presbyters (πρεσβύτιδες, *viduae ecclesiasticae*), like those, who in the age after the apostles exercised a certain oversight over the female part of the congregation, particularly over widows and orphans;² or finally, according to Neander’s view,³ merely such widows as were supported by the church, and, though without official character, were expected to set before the rest of their sex the example of a walk and conversation wholly devoted to God. The first interpretation we hold to be the most probable. Provision for destitute widows

¹ As is pre-supposed in the *Cod. Theodos.* L. 16, Tit. 2, Lex. 27: “Nulla nisi emensis 60 annis *secundum praeceptum Apostoli* (comp. 1 Tim. v. 9) ad *Diaconissarum* consortium transferatur.” Among modern scholars this interpretation is defended particularly by Rothe, p. 243, *et seq.*, and Wieseler; *Chronol. des apost. Zeitalters*, p. 309, *et seq.*

² So Chrysostom, and, after him, especially Mosheim, in his *Exposition of the Epistles to Timothy*, p. 444–446 (who had before, on the contrary, in his *Comment. de reb. chr. a. Const. M.*, referred the passage to the deaconesses), Heidenreich, De Wette, and Wiesinger, *ad loc.*

³ *Apost. Gesch.* p. 265, *et seq.* So also Jerome, Theodoret, and others.

was, from the first, an important branch of practical charity in the Christian church (comp. Acts vi. 1). But it was at the same time highly desirable to make this class of persons, if possible, of service to the church, even from regard for the poor themselves, that they might eat their bread with honour and satisfaction, without violating the maxim: "If any would not work, neither should he eat" (2 Thess. iii. 10). Respecting this Paul now furnishes the necessary instructions (1 Tim. v. 3, *et seq.*) He first speaks of widows in general, and directs, that the church support those who are "widows indeed," *i.e.* truly solitary and helpless (as the Greek term *χήρα*, *the desolate*, of itself implies), and who lead an honourable and pious life in retired communion with God; but not those who had children or other relatives to depend on, or who by their irregular conduct had already cut off their spiritual connection with the church (verses 3–8). Then in verses 9 and 10 he distinguishes in the circle of these pious widows a still smaller class of those who were matriculated or enrolled, and demands in them certain qualifications, which it is most natural to refer to the office of deaconess. If we understand *καταλεγέσθω*, ver. 9, of an insertion merely in the list of those who were to be supported from the congregational fund, the limitation of this benefit to such as were over sixty years of age and had been but once married, is repugnant to reason and Christian charity; since younger widows and those of a second marriage might be equally destitute and worthy of assistance. It is also inconsistent with the context; for Paul himself, ver. 14, advises the younger widows to marry again, which, in this view, would have been to cut themselves off from all prospect of help in case of a second widowhood. This interpretation, too, leaves it inexplicable, why he should speak of a special vow, to which he seems to refer in the words: *ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν*, ver. 12. The difficulty falls away, if *καταλεγέσθω* be understood to mean election and ordination to a particular office. And to this also the other requisitions mentioned would seem to look. For, in addition to advanced age, securing general respect and constancy in service,¹ and besides monogamy, which was also required of bishops and deacons (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12), the apostle demands of such a widow,

¹ The church subsequently did not limit itself strictly to the sixty years. The council of Chalcedon reduced the age of service for deaconesses to the fortieth year.

that she should have an unspotted reputation, experience in the training of children, and some distinction for hospitality, benevolence, and exemplary piety in general. This prescription, however, does not necessarily exclude virgins from the office of deaconess, where they had the requisite moral qualifications; though for many of its duties these were certainly not so well fitted as experienced, venerable matrons.¹

§ 136. *The Angels of the Apocalypse. Rise of Primitive Episcopacy.*

Finally, at the close of the apostolic period, we meet with a peculiar class of officers, the *angels* of the seven churches of Asia Minor, to whom the epistles in the Revelation of St John (chaps. ii. and iii.) are addressed, and who mark the transition from the apostolical to the episcopal constitution in its primitive Catholic form. What these angels were is, however, a matter of controversy. The basis of our interpretation must be the passage, i. 20: "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks, which thou sawest, are the seven churches." 1. We must at the outset discard the view, that the angels here correspond to the deputies of the Jewish synagogues (the שְׁלִיחֵי הַמִּצְבֵּי, *legati ecclesiae*).² For these had an entirely subordinate place, being mere clerks, or readers of the standing forms of prayers, and messengers of the synagogues; whereas the angels in question are compared to stars, and represented as presiding over the churches; nor have we elsewhere any trace of the transfer of that Jewish office to the Christian church. 2. Nor, on the other hand, can we consider them as proper angels, the heavenly guardians and representatives of the churches; as with

¹ Many expositors, following Chrysostom, take also the women mentioned in 1 Tim. iii. 11 for deaconesses. But the term γυναῖκες is too indefinite for this, and the whole connection gives it much rather a reference to the wives of deacons and bishops.

² So Vitranga, Lightfoot, even Bengel, and latterly also Winer, who, in the 3d ed. of his *Reallexik.*, under the article "Synagogen," Part II. p. 550, Note 2, confidently affirms: "The ἄγγελος τῆς ἐκκλησίας Rev. ii. 2, is simply the שְׁלִיחֵי הַמִּצְבֵּי,"—with a reference to Ewald's *Comment.* on the Apoc. p. 104. Against this De Wette, *ad Apoc.* i. 20 (p. 41), justly observes: "No interpretation can be more opposed to the spirit of the book. How could the author, who so often speaks of angels, and of their presiding over particular spheres (vii. 1; ix. 11; xvi. 5), be led to use the term here in so low and common a sense?"

Daniel every nation has its tutelar angel.¹ For it is altogether incompatible with the Biblical idea of angels, that letters should be written to them, with exhortations to repentance, fidelity, and steadfastness, describing them as rich, poor, hot, cold, lukewarm, and as having a particular place of residence. 3. More probable is the view, that the angels here are nothing but a figurative personification of the churches themselves.² In favour of this hypothesis are the facts, that their names are never mentioned; that their persons are left entirely out of view; and that what the Spirit writes to them, is intended for the whole congregation. But it is decisive against this view, that in chap. i. 20 they are explicitly distinguished from the golden candlesticks or churches; and as these are thus already exhibited under a figure, it would be evidently incongruous and confusing to personify them again under another image in the same connection,—that is, to express one symbol, the candlesticks, by another, the stars. 4. The only true interpretation, as well as the oldest and most generally received, is the one, which makes the angels the *rulers* and *teachers* of the congregations, whom Daniel (xii. 3) also compares to stars. They are styled angels, as being the ambassadors or messengers of God to the churches,³ on whom devolved the pastoral care and government (comp. Matth. xviii. 10; Acts xii. 15), and who were thus accountable for the condition of their charges (comp. Acts xx. 28). This term is chosen, therefore, to remind the rulers of their divine mission, their high vocation, and their heavy responsibility. So in Mal. ii. 7 the priest is called the “messenger (angel) of the Lord;” and in Mal. iii. 1 it is said of the prophet, the forerunner of the Messiah: “Behold I will send my messenger” (angel); as also in Matth. xi. 10, where this prophecy, with its honorary title, is fixed on John the Baptist (comp. also Haggai i. 13: “Then spake Haggai, the Lord’s angel, in the Lord’s message unto the people.” Is. xlii. 19; xliv. 26).

¹ So some church fathers; and, of modern commentators on the Apocalypse, Züllig and De Wette, the latter of whom, however, approaches the third view, making the angels to be the churches themselves in their spiritual, heavenly relation.

² So Arethas, Salmasius, Gabler, and others.

³ Not conversely, the messengers of the churches to God, as Dr Robinson has it in his *Lexic.* (p. 6, new ed. 1850): “The angels of the seven churches are probably the prophets or pastors of those churches, who were the messengers, delegates, of the churches to God in the offering of prayer, service,” etc.

But this interpretation still leaves room for two different views. Either the angels are concrete individuals; and then they must be regarded as actual bishops, though with very small dioceses, not exceeding the bounds of a moderate pastoral charge, with the only exception perhaps of Ephesus. This is the view of almost all the Catholic expositors, and of most of the English Episcopalians.¹ And we should have here, accordingly, a proof of the existence of the episcopal system, at least in its incipient form, towards the close of the first century, when the Apocalypse was written.² Or they may be the ministry collectively, the whole board of officers, including both the presbyters and the deacons.³ This view has unquestionably in its favour the passages already quoted from the Old Testament, where the name angel is applied to the whole priestly and prophetic order; as also the fact, that certainly not the bishops alone, but all the officers were responsible for the moral state of their churches, and formed the proper representation of them. Compare Acts xx. 17, 28, which shows that at least in the time of Paul there were a number of elders in Ephesus, to whom *collectively* it belonged to “feed the church of God;” also 1 Peter v. 1–5.

But even in the latter case the impartial inquirer must allow that this phrasology of the Apocalypse already looks towards the *idea of episcopacy* in its primitive form, that is, to a monarchical concentration of governmental power in one person, bearing a

¹ Dr Thiersch also favours this interpretation in his *Gesch. der apost. Kirche*, p. 278, where he says, “What are the angels of the seven churches but superior pastors, each at the head of a congregation, and at least similar to the later bishops? The ancients looked on them as bishops. Of all the church fathers who touch upon the matters, not one (?) thinks of any other interpretation.”

² Among the ancients the word ἄγγελος, like its grammatical equivalent ἀπόστολος, sometimes occurs as the designation of a bishop, as in Soerates, *H. E.* IV. 23; and in the Anglo-Saxon church the corresponding expression, *Gods Bydels*, i.e. *Die nuntii et ministri*, comp. Bingham's *Orig.* I. 83, and Rothe l. c. p. 503. Such use of these terms, however, no doubt arose from the above interpretation of the Apocalypse, and hence proves nothing for the antiquity of episcopacy.

³ So, among modern commentators, especially Hengstenberg, *Die Offenb. des h. Joh.* I., p. 153, *et seq.* He refers, not inaptly, to the introduction of Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians: “Polycarp and the elders with him (καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι) to the church of God dwelling at Philippi,” and to the superscription of the epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians: “Especially if they are one with the bishop, and with the presbyters and the deacons, who are with him.” It must be admitted, however, that here, particularly in the epistles of Ignatius, even in the smaller recension, the bishop plainly rises above the presbyters as the chief leader and responsible head of the church.

patriarchal relation to the congregation, and responsible, in an eminent sense for the spiritual condition of the whole. This view is confirmed by the fact, that among the immediate disciples of John we find at least one—Polycarp—who according to the unanimous tradition of Irenæus (his own disciple, himself a bishop),¹ of Tertullian,² Eusebius,³ and Jerome,⁴ was, by apostolical appointment, actually bishop of Smyrna, one of the seven churches of the Apocalypse. Add to this the statement of Clement of Alexandria,⁵ that John after his return from Patmos appointed “bishops ;” the Epistles of Ignatius, of the beginning of the second century, which already distinguish the bishop from the presbytery, as the head of the congregation, and in which the three orders pyramidically culminate in a regular hierarchy, although without the least trace yet of a primacy ; and finally, the fact, that Asia Minor was the very region where the rapid growth of heresies, and the pressure of outward dangers urged towards the establishment of a firmly consolidated system of government ;—and we assuredly have much in favour of the hypothesis so learnedly and ingeniously set forth lately by Dr Rothe, that the germs of episcopacy are to be found as early as the close of the first century, and particularly in the sphere of the later labours of St John. Dr Thiersch arrives at a similar result. But even in this case we must still, with the latter historian, insist on an important distinction between the “angels” of the book of Revelation, and the later diocesan bishops. For, aside from the very limited extent of their charges, as compared with the large territory of most Greek, Roman Catholic and Anglican bishops, these angels stood *below* the apostles and their legates, and were not yet invested with the great power (particularly the right to confirm and ordain), which fell to the later bishops after the death of the apostles. For, while they lived, they were beyond all question the holders and executives of the supreme authority in doctrine and government, and administered ordination either in person or by their delegates. The latter is expressly affirmed of John, in the statement of Clement of

¹ *Adv. Haer.* III. 3.

² *De praescr. Haer.* c. 32 : “Sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert.”

³ *H. E.* III. 36.

⁴ *Catal. s. Polyc* : “Polycarpus, Joannis apostoli discipulus, ab eo Smyrnae episcopus ordinatus,” etc.

⁵ *Quis dives salvus*, c. 42.

Alexandria above cited. The angels accordingly, if we are to understand by them single individuals, must be considered as forming the transition from the presbyters of the apostolic age to the bishops of the second century.

In addition to this, however, the episcopal system was simultaneously making its way also in other parts of the church; in Jerusalem, where James held in all respects the position of a bishop, as in fact he is directly styled, even by the oldest fathers, bishop of Jerusalem;¹ in Antioch and Rome, whose first bishops are said to have been appointed by the apostles themselves, and are known to us by name on the testimony of such men as Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Eusebius, and other ancient documents. Indeed, almost all the evangelists or delegates of the apostles are in their later years placed by tradition in particular episcopal sees (comp. § 131). If now we consider, in fine, that in the second century the episcopal system existed, as a historical fact, in the whole church, east and west, and was unresistingly acknowledged, nay, universally regarded as at least indirectly of divine appointment; we can hardly escape the conclusion, that this form of government naturally grew out of the circumstances and wants of the church at the end of the apostolic period, and could not have been so quickly and so generally introduced without the sanction, or at least acquiescence, of the surviving apostles, especially of John, who laboured on the very threshold of the second century, and left behind him a number of venerable disciples. At all events it needs a strong infusion of scepticism or of traditional prejudice to enable one, in the face of all these facts and witnesses, to pronounce the episcopal government of the ancient church a sheer apostasy from the apostolic form, and a radical revolution.² But as the

¹ Comp. above, § 95, and the close of § 129.

² We need scarcely say, that our position here is not dogmatical and sectarian at all, but entirely historical. The high antiquity, the usefulness, and the necessity of the episcopal form of government in the times before the Reformation, does not necessarily make it of force for all succeeding ages. For we have no passage in the N. T. which prescribes three orders, or any particular form of church government (excepting the ministry itself), as essential to the existence of the church; and history abundantly proves that Christian life has flourished under various forms of government. Presbyterians (of the Scotch jure divino school) and Episcopalians in this controversy very frequently become equally one-sided and pedantic. While the former set up the apostolic church under a particular traditional view as the

clearer data for the rise and character of the episcopal system all lie outside of the New Testament, the more detailed examination of them belongs rather to the second period, than to the history of the apostolic church.

absolute standard, too little regarding even many important facts of the New Testament, and either entirely rejecting or distorting the weighty testimony of church antiquity; the latter likewise attribute an undue importance to their opposite system of government, and make the question of outward ecclesiastical organization what it evidently is not, the great central question of the church. The ancient church before and after the Nicene council,—the age to which Anglican Protestantism is so fond of appealing, and with which it imagines itself identical,—held with the same earnestness to many other doctrines and practices, which are far more Catholic than Protestant, and are discarded even by the English Episcopal church. Think, for instance, of the early views on the primacy, on celibacy, on ascetic and monastic life, on the meritoriousness of good works, on the eucharistic sacrifice, etc. In the great controversy between Catholicism and Protestantism the question between Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism holds an altogether subordinate place. Anglicanism, which acknowledges the thirty-nine articles as its symbol, differs from the other churches of the Reformation, not in kind, but only in degree, and in its principle stands or falls with Protestantism as a whole. Hence the Roman church treats Anglican converts, even though they be priests and bishops, just as she treats those who come from Lutheran, Presbyterian, or Puritan ranks, and does not even acknowledge their confirmation, much less their ordination.

FOURTH BOOK.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

§ 137. *Import of the Christian Worship, and its Relation to the Jewish.*

WORSHIP has a twofold significance. It is designed, first, to awaken the Christian life, especially by preaching and baptism; secondly, to sustain and increase the life already existing, to present it as an offering to God,¹ and to celebrate the marriage of the church with her heavenly Bridegroom. This also is done partly by preaching and the exposition of the Scriptures, partly by prayer, singing, confession of faith, and participation in the Lord's Supper. It has reference exclusively to believers; it is worship in the strict and proper sense, not limited to the church militant, but continued in heaven, forming an essential constituent of the eternal bliss, of which it is on earth a foretaste. Public adoration and praise of the triune God is the highest and holiest act which the congregation can perform. Christ, indeed, gave no more complete instructions or binding prescriptions respecting the particular forms of worship, than He did respecting the church constitution. But He sanctioned by His own practice, and spiritualized the essential elements of the Jewish cultus; left a model prayer, and the precious promise of his presence in every assembly of believers (Matth. xviii. 20); and at the same time, by the institution of preaching, and of the holy sacraments of baptism and the supper,² fixed the fundamental elements of

¹ Comp. 1 Peter ii. 5. Heb. xiii. 15.

² Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24-26.

the Christian worship, from which it then gradually developed itself under the special direction of the Holy Ghost, and according to the necessities of the apostolic age.

Simultaneously with the rise of the Christian church on the day of Pentecost appeared also the Christian cultus in both its forms, as designed for the edification of the disciples, and for the conversion of unbelievers; and in Acts ii. 42, the essential parts of this social worship of God are stated as (1) the teaching of the apostles, including preaching and the exposition of the Scriptures, particularly of the prophecies and their fulfilment by Christ; (2) fraternal fellowship, which here embraces no doubt also the contributions for the poor;¹ (3) breaking of bread, that is, the administration of the Lord's Supper in connection with the agapae; (4) prayer, including petition, intercession, and thanksgiving.

The worship of the primitive church, like its government, was conformed in some measure to the existing institutions of the temple and synagogue; but these were made to refer to Christ, as their living centre, and were thus spiritualized and transformed. The apostles felt the need to maintain, as long as was at all possible, their connection with the worship of their fathers, especially as the Lord himself had so often visited the temple, and had participated in the solemnities of the great feasts. They used to visit the sanctuary at the accustomed hours of prayer; Acts iii. 1, and ii. 46, where it is said of the Christians in general, "that they continued daily with one accord in the temple." But besides this, they assembled also in private houses, as is shown by the words immediately following—"breaking bread from house to house."² Thus the Lord's Supper, and love-feasts were held at the houses of the converts in rotation, making each family a temple.

It may with tolerable certainty be supposed that the Jewish Christians, particularly the congregation at Jerusalem, observed the whole ceremonial law with its weekly and yearly festivals, and did not formally renounce the cultus of the Old Testament theocracy till the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. In

¹ Comp. Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 4; ix. 13.

² Κατ' οἶκον we must translate with Beza, *domatim*, *per singulas domos*, like κατὰ πόλιν, Titus i. 5, in the sense of *oppidatim*.

favour of this view are Paul's controversy with the Judaising Galatians,¹ whom he opposes, not because they kept the Jewish feasts, but because they set up this observance as a condition of salvation, and wished to lay the yoke of the law even on the Gentile Christians, who were not bound to it; the xivth and xvth chapters of Romans, where the apostle requires indulgence towards pious Jewish Christians, who scrupulously distinguished days, and lived an ascetic life; the advice which James and his elders gave to Paul in reference to the Nazarite vow (Acts xxi. 20-25); the term "synagogue," which James (ii. 2) applies to the worshipping assemblies of Christians; finally, that old tradition which makes this James to have daily visited the temple, and prayed on his knees for all the people till his death. Without some such close conformity to the sacred customs of the fathers, there is no accounting for the high reputation of this head of the church of Jerusalem among the proper Jews, and for his being honoured with the title of "the Just."²

Not only the Jewish Christians, however, but even the liberal apostle of the Gentiles, the enemy of all spiritual bondage and mechanical ceremonialism, like a genuine conservative, conformed, as far as possible, to the law, and endeavoured to be to the Jews a Jew, that he might make them Christians; while, on the other hand, he bravely defended the freedom of the Gentiles, to whom the external law had not been given. On his missionary tours, as we have already seen, he always went first into the synagogues, connected his preaching of the gospel with the usual reading and exposition of the Old Testament, and made it his rule to continue in this communion, until thrust out by obdurate unbelief. To this course he faithfully adhered in spite of all the hostilities of particular synagogues. He employed on his own person also, not merely out of accommodation, but from a real sense of its usefulness, the venerable ascetic discipline of the Jews, "to keep his body under," and strengthen his spiritual life. For even to the regenerate, so long as they remain in the body, the law is a means of salutary discipline, of regulating the passions, and strengthening the will. Witness Paul's vow at Cenchreae (Acts xviii. 18, 21); his earnest desire

¹ Gal. iv. 10; v. 1, *et seq.* Comp. Col. ii. 16.

² Comp. above, § 95.

to keep the feast of Pentecost in Jerusalem (xviii. 21 ; xx. 16) ; and his joining the Nazarites of the church in that place (xxi. 18-21 ; comp. § 82). It is asserted, indeed, by Baur and his followers, that these traits are irreconcilable with Paul's anti-Jewish position as set forth particularly in the epistle to the Galatians ; and to be therefore attributed to the effort of the author of the Acts, to reconcile the Jewish and Gentile Christians. But all that is true in this is, that Luke exhibits with special predilection the conservative aspect of Paul's course without thereby doing any violence to history. For Paul was opposed not to the law itself, but only to making salvation depend on the observance of the law or on any human work ; thus laying a yoke of slavery on the redeemed spirit, placing the essence of morality and piety, not in the disposition, but in something outward and mechanical, and consciously or unconsciously repudiating the fundamental principle of the gospel, Christ the only fountain of salvation. And with opposition to this there might very well be united a high conception of the importance of the law in proper dependence on the gospel, as also of form in due subordination to spirit. Then again Paul admitted, that the Jewish-Christian position was entitled to regard. He explicitly enjoined charity towards the weak, who had not yet been able fully to comprehend the freedom of the gospel ;¹ and, in general, he had no desire to do away the national antagonism between Jews and Gentiles (which entered also into matters of religion) by any violent or premature measures.²

When at last the divine judgment broke upon obdurate Judaism and destroyed the temple, the centre of the theocratic cultus, then also came forth the Christian worship in full independence from behind the veil. The Jewish and Gentile-Christian systems were reconciled by retaining, indeed, in the church the essential elements of the Old Testament service, but divesting them of their narrow legal character, and regenerating them by the peculiar spirit of the gospel. The Jewish Sabbath was lost in the Christian Sunday. The ancient passover and pente-

¹ Rom. xiv. 1-6. 1 Cor. viii. 9-13.

² 1 Cor. vii. 18-20. Comp. what we have said on former occasions (§ 67, 71, 76, 82) respecting the conduct of this truly free apostle towards his brethren of the circumcision.

cost were exchanged for the feasts of the death and resurrection of Christ and of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, to which they had typically pointed. The bloody sacrifices gave place to the thankful commemoration of the one offering on the cross, which wrought out an eternal redemption. The temple made with hands was demolished, but was rebuilt by the crucified and risen Messiah in far greater glory, as a worship of God in spirit and in truth (comp. John ii. 19 ; iv. 23, *et seq.*)

§ 138. *Sacred Places and Times.*

In opposition to the superstitious restriction of the worship of God to a particular *place*, whether Jerusalem or Gerizim, Christianity teaches the purely spiritual and therefore immaterial and omnipresent nature of God, and a corresponding worship of God in spirit and in truth (John iv. 24). The whole world is His temple. Heaven is His throne ; earth His footstool ; and everywhere, even in deserts and in caves, may His presence be fully enjoyed. This of course, however, does not forbid the setting apart particular localities for exclusively religious purposes. Such consecration, on the contrary, is required by our finite, sensuous nature, and the need of *social* worship. The Christians in Jerusalem, as we have already remarked, visited the temple at the usual hours of prayer ; but besides this they assembled also in private houses for devotional purposes, and especially for celebrating the Lord's Supper.¹ Out of the capital, the synagogue, where the Lord,² and after His example the apostle Paul,³ were accustomed to teach, was the most natural place for the first preaching of the missionaries ; and where the whole Jewish population of a city went over to the true faith, the synagogue of itself became a Christian church. But this was probably very rarely the case, or at any rate can have occurred only in the smaller communities. Commonly the new converts were thrust out by the unbelieving majority, and had no alternative but to hire some public place,⁴ or to meet for mutual edification in the

¹ Luke xxiv. 53. Acts ii. 46 ; iii. 1 ; v. 42.

² Matth. iv. 23 ; ix. 35. Mark i. 39. Luke iv. 15, 44. John xviii. 20.

³ Acts xiii. 5, 14 ; xiv. 1 ; xvii. 10, 17 ; xviii. 19 ; xix. 8.

⁴ Here may perhaps be cited Acts xix. 19, if by Tyrannus we understand not a Rabbi, but, as is more probable, a heathen rhetorician (Suidas mentions a sophist of

private houses of their more prominent brethren, as in the house of Lydia at Philippi (Acts xvi. 15, 40), of Jason at Thessalonica (xvii. 5, 7), of Justus at Corinth (xviii. 7), of Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 19). In the larger cities and congregations there were several such places of meeting, and the assemblies of Christians, which held their regular devotional exercises in them, were for this reason called the churches of such and such a *house*.¹ That separate church edifices were erected during this period, is of course not to be supposed; because the Christians were too poor, but especially because they had as yet no legal existence as a body in the Roman empire, and public places of devotion would only have increased the zeal of the Jews and pagans against them. Thus did the greatest teachers preach in the humblest places! Nay, the Saviour of the world was born in a stable, and the Lord of glory lay in a manger!

With the *time* of divine worship the case was the same as with the place. The absolute spirituality of God, which the Saviour opposes to the narrow, sensuous notions of the Samaritan woman (John iv. 21, *et seq.*), implies, that God may and should be worshipped not only everywhere, but also at all times. Christianity has, therefore, in reality abolished the former abstract distinction of sacred and secular seasons, as well as the distinction of clean and unclean beasts and nations (comp. Acts x. 11, *et seq.*) It redeems man in every respect from subjection to the perishable forces of nature. In idea, the *whole* life of the Christian should be an unbroken Sunday, every day and every hour being devoted to the service of the Lord; and what here lies before us as the grand moral problem of our lives, will one day find its full solution in the eternal sabbath of the saints, which is promised to the people of God!"² But as the limitation of our earthly life by space requires particular places of worship, so the tem-

this name), and by his "school," in which Paul taught for two years, a philosophical lecture-room.

¹ *Εκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον*. Rom. xvi. 4, 5, 14, 15. 1 Cor. xvi. 19. Col. iv. 15. Philem. 2. Comp. above, § 132.

² Comp. Heb. iv. 1-11. Rev. xiv. 13. This ideal point of view Dr Neander, in his articles *Ueber die christliche Sonntagsfeier* (in the "Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben," 1850, No. 26-28), holds too exclusively, and allows, therefore, of no satisfactory vindication of the Sabbath.

poral character of our existence and the nature of our avocations demand, even for the sake of order, the separation of certain hours and days for exclusively religious purposes. While the where and when, not indeed of the more spiritual Old Testament worship, yet of the popular Jewish as well as pagan cultus, stood opposed to the everywhere and always of the Christian system; the latter, on the other hand, can and does without prejudice to its spiritual and universal character accommodate itself to place and time, and will do so, till the earthly order of things shall be wholly transformed into a heavenly and eternal. So in fact with prayer. We should be always in the spirit of prayer. Our whole life should be an unbroken intercourse with God (1 Thess. v. 17). Nevertheless we are obliged to pray in the strict sense, to pour out our souls in petition, intercession, and thanksgiving before God, at certain times.

The apostle Paul seems indeed at first sight to repudiate all separation of days, months, and years as times of special solemnity.¹ He censures it in the Galatians as a falling back to the elementary religion of carnal Judaism and to the bondage of the law, nay, as a pagan nature-worship, that after being converted from heathenism to Christianity they suffered the observance of Jewish Sabbaths and fast-days (*ἡμέρας*), new moons (*μῆνας*), yearly feasts, such as the Passover, Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles (*καιρούς*), the sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee (*ἐνιαυτούς*), to be imposed upon them by Judaizing errorists. But we have to remember, that Paul here has in view a slavish, superstitious observance of these feasts, as though the salvation of all, Gentiles as well as Jews, depended on it; an observance, which, therefore, in reality sinks to the level of the pagan nature-worship, since the sun, moon, and planets produce those divisions of time, and are for this reason worshipped by the heathen as divine. This carnal, superstitious, and self-righteous sabbatism, which we observe also in the Colossian errorists (Col. ii. 16), stands undoubtedly in conflict with the fundamental doctrine of justifying, sanctifying, and saving faith in Christ as the only Redeemer, and with evangelical freedom. That Paul, however, did not condemn the observance of sacred times in themselves and under any cir-

¹ Gal. iv. 8-11. Comp. Col. ii. 16.

cumstances, is proved by his indulgence towards the scrupulous Jewish Christians in Rome (Rom. xiv. 5, 6), and by his own practice, his ardent desire to keep the feast of Pentecost in Jerusalem.¹ It is with this as with the law in general. In its temporal and national form and as a yoke of bondage, it is abolished by the gospel, but in its inmost spirit and essence it is fulfilled, preserved, and transformed into the internal, free, living power of love (Matth. v. 17); and as Christ is, on the one hand, the end of the law and the prophets, so on the other, He himself is the supreme lawgiver and prophet, and His life and Spirit are the absolute rule and guide of the new, regenerate existence.²

From this point of view the sacred times of the church are to be looked upon, not as a Jewish yoke, but as a salutary and indispensable ordinance of evangelical freedom, in which the Christian acquiesces with joy and gratitude, rises above the din of every-day life and business to the enjoyment of a heavenly, spiritual feast, and consecrates all his pursuits to the service of God. They are not a quittance for all other times, so that a man may confine his piety (as alas! many Christians do even to this day in their carnal Jewish notions) to Sunday and the hours of prayer, and then, so to speak, clear his account with God for a whole week, that he may during the week devote himself the more uninterruptedly to the world. They are a means for the gradual attainment of the power to "pray without ceasing," and for bringing about that state of things, in which all distinction of times shall disappear, and we shall be at all times before the throne of God, serving Him day and night (Rev. vii. 15).

In the division of the *day* the apostles and first Christians freely conformed to Jewish usage, and were accustomed to offer their prayers either in the temple or at home, especially in an upper chamber and upon the roof, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, or, according to our reckoning, at nine o'clock, the hour of morning sacrifice, at twelve, and at three, the time of evening sacrifice.³ To this they added the regular thanksgiving before and after

¹ Acts xviii. 21; xx. 16. Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 2, 8.

² Comp. Rom. iii. 27, where the apostle speaks of a "law of faith;" Gal. vi. 2, where he speaks of a "law of Christ;" and Rom. viii. 2, where he speaks of a "law of the Spirit of life."

³ Acts ii. 15; iii. 1; x. 9, 30.

meat,¹ as well as their private devotions after rising in the morning and before retiring to their rest.

As to the celebration of particular days of the *week*; we might infer, indeed, from the universal practice of the second century, that already in the first century Wednesday, and especially Friday, the day of Christ's death, were celebrated by a half-fast (*semijejunia*); for such customs cannot spring into vogue suddenly. But no proof of this can be cited from the New Testament. That Sunday was observed by the apostles, however, as the day of Christ's resurrection, is certain, and its importance demands for it a more minute examination.

§ 139. *The Christian Sunday.*

For *weekly* worship the Mosaic law, and in fact the original order of the creation, appointed the seventh day, as a day of holy rest; not for slothful inactivity, but for the adoration of God, the highest and happiest work of the soul. The Christians, indeed, taking pattern from the daily morning and evening sacrifices in the temple, were accustomed to meet every day for social edification and the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The book of Acts expressly tells us (ii. 46), that they continued "daily" with one accord in the temple, and broke bread from house to house; and (xix. 9) that Paul preached the gospel "daily" in the school of Tyrannus at Ephesus. But with this the believers united from the first the special consecration of one day in the week to the worship of God, and thus, even when the daily meetings could not be uniformly kept up, they devoted at least the seventh part of their lifetime exclusively to the interest of the immortal soul. The Jewish Christians, as already remarked, adhered to the Old Testament Sabbath, especially in Palestine; but with it they celebrated also the first day of the week in memory of the Saviour's resurrection, and that too, it would appear, from the very day of the resurrection onward (comp. John xx. 19, 26), which they looked upon as sanctioned for such purpose by Christ himself. For the assertion of some moderns (even Neander), that the observance of Sunday arose first in Paul's churches (some twenty years afterwards), and thence passed to the others,

¹ Comp. Matth. xv. 39. John vi. 11. Acts xxvii. 35. 1 Cor. x. 30, *et seq.* 1 Tim. iv. 3-5.

is altogether gratuitous, and extremely improbable in view of the scrupulous adherence of the Jewish converts to the traditional forms of piety, and their jealousy of any innovation, especially those which originated with the Gentiles. The Gentile Christians, for whom the ceremonial law had no authority, distinguished in this way only the first day of the week, as the day of the completion of the new creation. After the destruction of Jerusalem this became the prevailing practice of the Christian church, and gradually supplanted the observance of the Jewish Sabbath.¹

The apostolical origin of the Christian Sabbath may be inferred with tolerable certainty from several passages of the New Testament; especially if we add to them the unequivocal testimony of tradition from the end of the first century and the beginning of the second, according to which, Sunday was at that time already universally observed in the church.² The first clear trace of the celebration of Sunday we meet in Acts xx. 7. From this we see, that the Christians assembled on the first day of the week for mutual edification and for the administration of the Lord's Supper, and that Paul waited in Troas till this particular day, that he might enjoy a long and cordial talk with them "until midnight" respecting the kingdom of God. Again, it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 2, that Sunday was the day appointed by the apostle, for the Christians to lay by their charitable contributions for the poor. Still weightier is the testimony of the Revelation of St John, of later date. For while in the two cases cited from Paul's history this day bears no distinctive, sacred name, but is called simply the first day of the week, the first day after the Sabbath,³ it appears in Rev. i. 10 already under the significant appellation: "the

¹ In some single Jewish-Christian communities in the East, however, the Jewish Sabbath was retained for a long time *together with* the Christian Sunday. *Euseb.* III. 27.

² See the *Epistle of Barnabas*, ch. 15; Ignatius, *Ep. ad Magnes.* ch. 9: ("The Christians celebrate no longer the Sabbath, but the Lord's day, on which their life arose to them by Him"); the famous letter of the younger Pliny to Trajan, *Epist.* X. 97; Justin Martyr, etc. It is absolutely inconceivable, that so important an institution as the Christian Sabbath could have come into perfectly universal observance in so short a time, and supplanted the Jewish Sabbath enjoined by the Mosaic Decalogue, *without the sanction of the apostles.*

³ *Μία τῶν σαββάτων* (comp. Matth. xxviii. 1. Mark xvi. 2. Luke xxiv. 1). This phrase Luther has wrongly translated, taking *σαββάτω* in the strict sense, whereas it means, in this connection, the Sabbath-week.

Lord's day" (ἡ κυριακὴ ἡμέρα); that is, the day of Christ, to whom John refers everything. In the same sense the paschal supper is styled in 1 Cor. xi. 20 "the Lord's Supper." This expression plainly points to the religious observance of Sunday, on which the holy seer received the revelation of the future triumphs of Christ and His church; and it shows at the same time the place which that day held in the minds of the primitive Christians.¹ Sunday was the day which the Lord had made and given to His church, and which, therefore, in an altogether peculiar manner belonged, and should be devoted, to Him; the day of His *resurrection*, of the finishing and sealing of the new creation and the triumph over sin, death, and hell. The resurrection of Christ is the centre of our faith and the ground of our hope; and we have every reason to suppose, that He himself intended to consecrate the day of His resurrection in the view of His disciples when He re-appeared to them, not only on that day itself, but exactly on the eighth day after for the sake of Thomas; when He blessed them on it with His divine peace; and when he poured out His Holy Spirit upon them on the fiftieth day after, which was likewise a Sunday (comp. § 54), thus at the same time consecrating it as *the birth-day of the Christian church*. In these *facts* is to be found the objective divine sanction of the observance of Sunday. From them the observance necessarily developed itself. And they give us at the same time a hint as to the *idea* and *import* of Sunday in distinction from the Sabbath.

For as this new creation, the resurrection of Christ and the founding of His church, is greater than the first creation of the heavens and the earth, and brings it to its perfection, so does the Christian Sunday transcend the Jewish Sabbath. The Sabbath commemorated the natural creation (Ex. xx. 11; xxxi. 17), and at the same time (what should not be overlooked) the typical redemption, the exodus of Israel from his Egyptian bondage (comp. Deut. v. 15).² Sunday, on the contrary, is the

¹ Weitzel, *Die christliche Passafeyer der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, p. 170, justly observes: "Why did the prophet receive his visions on this particular day? Because the *κυριακή* is the day of unusually absorbing intercourse with the Lord, the day of uncommonly deep intuition; because on this day men, even in primitive times, were very peculiarly favoured with revelations of Christ."

² It is worthy of remark, that this Exodus took place in the night of the fourteenth, upon the fifteenth, of Nisan; therefore not on the seventh, but on the first day of the

festival of the moral creation, of the regeneration of humanity to a holy and blissful life, and of the perfect redemption through Christ, the Prince of life and peace. The former is only a type and prophecy of the latter; the latter is at once the anti-type and fulfilment of the former, and a precious pledge of the promised eternal rest of God in man and man in God, the unbroken spiritual feast of the heavenly Canaan.¹ By the humiliation of Christ in the tomb, by the rejection of the Saviour of the world, the Jewish Sabbath was desecrated,² and made a day of mourning. But from its ruins arose, with the bursting of the first-fruits of the new creation from the grave of the old, the idea of a day of the eternal Sun of Righteousness; of victory over all the powers of darkness; of holy spiritual freedom, of divine joy, the “joy in the Holy Ghost,” which should sanctify all earthly happiness. The temporary, unessential *form* of the Mosaic sabbatical institution was stripped away, but its substance preserved, spiritualized, and fully unfolded. From the evangelical Christian point of view, the observance of this day appears not as a yoke or as a matter of constraint, but as an invaluable privilege, a precious gift of God, a weekly season of refreshing and of delightful communion with God and with saints, a foretaste of eternal bliss. In fact, the Old Testament Sabbath was in its deepest import not merely a duty, but also a right to rest in the midst of unrest; a privilege of freedom in earthly bondage. It was not merely a binding statute, but at the same time a gracious release from the accompanying and equally binding command to labour; a memento of the blessed rest of God and the redemption of his people; a gospel, therefore, in the law, a “little refreshing paradise on the cursed soil of the world.” This merciful design of the sabbatical institution is especially manifest in the express reference of the fourth commandment to man-servant and maid-servant, to the stranger, and even to the beast of burden, and in such passages as Exod. xxiii. 12, and Num. x. 10, where the Sabbath and all the festival days are represented as days of joy and refreshment. Here we discern

week, on Sunday, as appears from a comparison of Exod. xii. 1-6 with Exod. xvi. 1 and 5, *et seq.*

¹ Comp. Heb. iv. 1-11. Rev. xiv. 13.

² In the same sense in which the temple was destroyed by His crucifixion; that is, the whole temple worship became invalid, comp. John ii. 19.

the connection of the Sabbath with the original Eden of innocence as well as with the future Eden of redemption, when the groaning creation shall be freed from subjection to vanity, and brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God (comp. Rom. viii. 19, *et seq.*) This sweet kernel of the gospel, hid beneath the shell of the Old Testament law, reached its perfect growth in *Christ*. Hence He calls himself also in this sense the Lord of the Sabbath (Matth. xii. 8), as conversely Sunday is called *His* day. For Christ has become the end of the law by fulfilling it. He is our peace (Eph. ii. 14), our rest from all the anxious works of the law, the refreshment of all the weary and heavy laden (Matth. xi. 28); and as the true light of the world, as the eternal spiritual sun, He makes the first day of the week a real *Sunday*, giving life and heat to its planets, the days of labour.

This direct derivation of the church festival of Sunday from the living centre of the gospel, Jesus Christ, the risen Prince of life, is certainly the primitive Christian view of it, and the one which best answers particularly to Paul's system of doctrine; whereas the *exclusively legal* view, which bases the institution primarily and directly on the fourth commandment, in the first place affords no sufficient explanation of the transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and secondly is utterly irreconcilable with the clear declarations of the New Testament. For our Lord more than once condemns the carnal, narrow-minded scrupulousness of the Jews in regard to the Sabbath, as in Matth. xii. 1-8, 9-14. Mark ii. 27; John vii. 22, 23; as also does the apostle Paul in Gal. iv. 8-11; Col. ii. 16, 17, where he represents the Sabbaths and other Old Testament festivals as mere shadowy types, and points from them to Christ, the living, bodily substance.¹ In our view, the

¹ There is only one passage in the New Testament which seems to favour the legal Jewish view, viz., Matth. xxiv. 20—"Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day." In the first place, however, the reference here is not to the Christian Sabbath, but to the Jewish; and, secondly, the Sabbath here comes into view, as carrying at that time a restraining force, being thus a parallel to winter (comp. Hengstenberg's "Kirchenzeitung," 1851, p. 47). Otherwise the passage would prove too much. It would sanction the legalism and stiff formalism of the Pharisees in the outward observance of the law; which, however, the Lord, in the passages above cited, most unequivocally denounces.

seventh day being the day of the Lord's abode in the tomb, was not at all suitable for the Christian weekly festival. The day of His resurrection is the only proper one for this. And it is genuinely evangelical to begin with thanksgiving for the gift of divine grace, with the solemn commemoration of redeeming love, to which we owe everything; and on this to build our own work. "We love Him because He *first* loved us." It is to be remembered besides, that even the Old Testament Sabbath, though the seventh day of God's labour, was not the seventh of man's; that on the contrary, it was to the original pair the first day after their complete creation, a holy day, which they spent under the smiles of God before beginning their daily labour in the garden.¹ The essential point in the fourth commandment is not the appointment of the seventh day, for in the sight of God all days are alike; but the general requisition, that every six days be devoted to labour, and every seventh to rest for the good of both body and soul; or that the seventh part of our earthly life be withdrawn from earthly employments and devoted exclusively to God and to our spiritual interests. Then again, the Old Testament Sabbath should not be placed in an abstract opposition to the other days; it must be regarded as the head of the whole Jewish system of worship. For the law, in fact, requires, besides the observance of this day, the celebration also of yearly festivals, and the offering of daily morning and evening sacrifices (Num. xxviii. 3-8). The separation so often made between the ceremonial law and the moral has very little support from the Scriptures. The former appears, on the contrary, as simply the expansion or continuation of the decalogue. Anna, who "departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day" (Luke ii. 37), fulfilled the real spirit of the Mosaic institution of the Sabbath.

On the other hand, however, with the *merely* legal view we must also, and in fact far more decidedly, reject the opposite and much more injurious extreme of a lax latitudinarian or *antinomian* view of Sunday, which deprives it of its divine foundation, bases it on mere utilitarian grounds, and leads in-

¹ Comp. on this point an interesting article in the "Evang. Kirchenzeitung," 1850, p. 720.

variably to a greater or less profanation of it. Against this the legal view, provided only it exclude not the evangelical, maintains its full authority, as grounded in the relation of the Sabbath to the original order of the creation and in its organic place in the decalogue amongst the eternally binding moral commands of God. There is also a dangerous pseudo-Pauline extravagance of evangelicalism, which mistakes the import and the perpetual necessity of the divine law, and degenerates into licentiousness. The law is still a schoolmaster to bring the unconverted to Christ, and for believers themselves it is the expression of the holy will of God and the rule of moral conduct. Hence also is the observance of Sunday not merely a privilege, but also a duty enjoined upon all Christians, a salutary means of discipline and of grace for a people, an indispensable preserver and promoter of public morality and religion, a mighty barrier to the flood of infidelity, a brazen wall around the word of God, and a source of incalculable blessing to family, state, and church.¹

Thus, therefore, is the keeping of the Christian Sunday, that "pearl of days," grounded in the creation, in the giving of the law, and in redemption, in the wants of nature as well as of faith; a blessed privilege and a holy duty; a gift and a means of grace; a heavenly rest amidst the unrest of earth; an anti-past and pledge of the saints' eternal sabbath in the kingdom of glory, when God shall be all in all.

§ 140. *The Yearly Festivals.*

Finally, as to the yearly festivals; of these we have very few traces in the New Testament. But substantially the same is true of them as of the Sabbath, viz., that the Jewish feasts are in their temporary, national, and typical form abolished, but in their essence preserved, and, by being referred to Christ, spiritualized and transformed, or exchanged for others which are

¹ This is incontrovertibly proved, especially by the examples of England, Scotland, and the United States. Hence the Anglo-American realism and the Reformed legalism certainly have their claims over against the German idealism and Lutheran evangelicalism. Though the former cannot be pronounced wholly free from the danger of Pharisaism, the latter, on the other hand, only too often degenerates into practical Sadducism; and, as to the observance of Sunday in particular, undue strictness is assuredly less dangerous, and far more beneficial to public morals than undue laxness.

better calculated to express and to embody the facts and ideas of the new creation. The yearly festivals, the Passover,¹ the feast of weeks or Pentecost,² the feast of Tabernacles,³ and the great day of atonement,⁴ are likewise, it is well known, of divine institution; and it is arbitrary to discard them entirely, at the same time that we maintain the perpetual validity of the command to keep the Sabbath. The moral and ritual laws cannot be separated in any such abstract way; and Paul in fact looks upon *all* festival seasons as alike, where he comes out against the Judaistic, self-righteous, and superstitious observance of them.⁵ Besides, the Jewish feasts had a typical reference to the main facts of the gospel history; the Passover, to the death and resurrection of Christ, the true paschal Lamb and the Redeemer of His people from the spiritual bondage of sin; and Pentecost, to the founding of the Christian church and the gathering of the first-fruits into the garner of eternal life.

These two feasts, Easter and Pentecost, as transformed by Christianity into the feasts of the resurrection of the Lord and of the outpouring of His Holy Spirit, were accordingly the first which were celebrated by the church. As early as the second century we find them universally and without opposition observed; and this gives strong presumptive evidence of their existence in the apostolic age. It is asserted, indeed (by Neander for instance), that in the New Testament, at least in Paul's writings, no Christian yearly festivals come to view. But we hold, that the indications of the observance of Easter by the primitive Christians are almost as strong as those of the apostolic observance of Sunday, and that in connection with reliable documents from the period immediately following they sufficiently prove the existence of that festival in the apostolic church. Christ crucified and risen was from the first the substance and the all-absorbing object of the Christian consciousness. Sunday derived its significance as a specifically Christian festival entirely from the fact of the resurrection, and was, as it were, a weekly Easter of re-

¹ Exod. xii. 1-28; xxiii. 15. Lev. xxiii. 4-8. Deut. xvi. 1-8.

² Exod. xxxiv. 22. Lev. xxiii. 15, 16. Deut. xvi. 10.

³ Exod. xxiii. 34-42. Deut. xvi. 12-15.

⁴ Exod. xxiii. 26-30. Lev. xvi. 1-34.

⁵ Gal. iv. 10. Col. ii. 16. Comp. Rom. xiv. 5, 6.

joicing, as Friday was the day of Christ's death and therefore a day of fasting and spiritual mourning. Of the Jewish Christians it could not but be expected, that, with the Sabbath and circumcision and the whole ceremonial law, they should also, after the example of the Lord, who was accustomed particularly to keep the Passover in Jerusalem,¹ observe all the annual feasts appointed by God through Moses, and put into them a Christian meaning. The distinction of days Rom. xiv. 5, certainly refers, not merely to the Sabbath, but to the feasts in general. Paul made the crucified and risen Saviour so much the centre of his whole faith and life, that he must undoubtedly have attached peculiar importance to the annual commemoration of this great fact. "He glories," says Weitzel,² "in knowing nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. 'If Christ be not risen,' exclaims he, 'your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.' The Holy Ghost is with him the seal of adoption, the earnest of a joyful resurrection, the living bond of Christian fellowship, the fountain of spiritual gifts. The death and the resurrection together with the outpouring of the Spirit are the foundation stones of his whole Christian system. With the original apostles the anniversaries of those events were sacred festival seasons. Why should they not have been important commemorative occasions also for Paul, who indeed was most solicitous to maintain fellowship with the older apostles and with the primitive church?" It is true, there is dispute as to the meaning of 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, where Paul calls Christ the "Passover sacrificed for us," and demands that the feast be kept "with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," *i.e.* in the Spirit of Christ, who has purged us from all the old leaven of sin. This may possibly refer to the continual observance of the Passover in the heart and by a holy walk. But since according to 1 Cor. xvi. 8 the epistle was written shortly before Easter, it is altogether natural and most probable, that the apostle here alludes to that feast, and distinguishes the Jewish from the Christian, the existence of which he thus implies. It is certainly not

¹ John ii. 13; v. 1; vi. 4; xi. 55; xii. 1; xiii. 1; vii. 2; x. 22. It is very remarkable that St John makes the Jewish festivals, especially the Passover, so prominent in the public life and ministry of Christ. He evidently considered them significant types of the leading facts of the Gospel history.

² In his work, *Die christliche Passafeier der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1848, p. 180.

accidental, that he waited for Pentecost in his own Gentile-Christian congregation of Ephesus, and esteemed it a privilege to spend it with them (*ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς πεντεκοστῆς*); as also he tarried in Troas till the next Sunday (Acts xx. 6). But besides this we have the explicit and conclusive statement of the Acts of the Apostles, that Paul spent Easter of the year 58 in the Gentile-Christian congregation of Philippi, not departing till the feast was over; and that he then hastened his journey, and even sailed by Ephesus, in order to keep Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts xviii. 21; xx. 6, 16).

But finally, the testimonies from the second century are here worthy of all attention.

In the well known paschal controversies, which related to the *time* of the festival of Christ's death and resurrection, not to the festival itself (for as to this there was even at that early period perfect unanimity), a host of the most credible witnesses, the Ephesian bishop, Polycrates, with his seven predecessors, and the bishops Melito, Thraseas, Sagaris, in behalf of their Asiatic custom of celebrating the Christian Passover according to the Jewish chronology always on the fourteenth of Nisan (whether this fell on Friday or any other day of the week), expressly appealed to the authority of the apostle John. Nay, the venerable Polycarp of Smyrna, John's personal disciple and friend, assured the Roman bishop in the year 160, that he himself had celebrated Easter with this apostle in the Oriental way, and that the other apostles also, with whom John had intercourse (Philip perhaps, in Hierapolis,) agreed with him. On the other side, the Roman church, in support of its custom (afterwards universally adopted) of celebrating Easter not on a particular day of the month, but on a certain day of the week,—the death of Christ always on a Friday, and his resurrection on a Sunday,—appealed with the same confidence to its oldest bishops and to the order of the apostles, Peter and Paul. These controversies in all probability had their ultimate ground in an unessential difference, which already existed, with all unity of spirit, in the practice of the various apostles and apostolic churches, according as they were ruled either by regard for the Jewish type, the Old Testament Passover, which always began on the 14th of Nisan, whatever day of the week this might be, or by regard to

the proper days of Christ's death and resurrection, Friday and Sunday.¹

Easter and Pentecost, however, are the only feasts, which can be traced back to the apostolic age. Of the observance of other festivals, Christmas for instance, we find not the least hint in the New Testament. It was only at a later period that the church went back from the centre of her faith, the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, to the beginning of his theanthropic life, and appointed a special feast for the mystery of the incarnation.

§ 141. *The Several Parts of Worship.*

The regular exercises of the apostolic worship were preaching, exposition of the Scriptures, prayer, singing, confession of faith, and administration of the sacraments. To these were added such extraordinary acts as prophesying, speaking with tongues, and interpreting of tongues, which have already been considered in the sections on spiritual gifts.² These, moreover, belong also under the general heads of preaching and prayer.

1. The *sermon* appears in the apostolic church mainly in the shape of a *missionary* discourse, designed to kindle life, and raise up churches; a simple historical testimony respecting Christ, the crucified and risen Saviour of the world. It was altogether practical, but pregnant with the profoundest ideas; unadorned, yet forcible; natural, yet ingeniously adapted to the circumstances; clear and deliberate, yet borne along on the wings of inspiration and holy enthusiasm; knowing nothing but the divine foolishness of the cross (1 Cor. ii. 2), but with this torch shedding a hallowing light upon all the relations of life. Poured forth from the fulness of the heart, it also went to the heart, and kindled the sacred fire of faith and love. It was the communication of the moral and religious life of the speaker to the susceptible hearer. This is especially true of the prophetic awakening and consolatory discourses, of which we have already treated above. That the apostles and evangelists read their discourses is of course not to be supposed; nor that they studied, wrote, and

¹ On this whole controversy about Easter, which we shall have occasion to discuss more minutely in a succeeding volume, compare the thoroughly learned and valuable work of Weitzel just quoted.

² Comp. above, § 117, *et seq.*

memorized them in our modern style. But their whole life was an uninterrupted study of the word, a constant living and moving in communion with God. Besides, there was of course a difference of gifts among them. Some planted; others watered; and the Lord followed both with His blessing (1 Cor. iii. 6). Judged by their discourses in the Acts and by their epistles, Peter and Paul must have been powerful revival preachers; while John and Apollos were best fitted to carry forward churches already established, the latter having also the gift of rhetorical elegance. Yet Paul also was equally endowed for watering and building up churches, as his epistles, which may be called sermons to believers, sufficiently show.

2. The *reading* of a portion of *Scripture*, with which was connected a practical exposition and exhortation, was an ancient custom of the synagogue (comp. Acts xiii. 15; xv. 21), which the Christians certainly appropriated from the first, as we find it universally prevalent in the second century. Paul declared all the Scriptures of the Old Testament to be *theopneustic*, i.e. pervaded by the Holy Spirit, and therefore always fitted for the spiritual instruction and correction of the church (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17). The Christians, however, after the rise of the New Testament literature, added to the Jewish Paraschioth and Hapthoroth (the lessons from the law or Pentateuch, and the prophets) the reading also of the Gospels and the apostolic epistles, or substituted the latter for the former; the Evangelium, according to the oldest division of the New Testament, corresponding to the law, and the Apostolos to the prophets, of the Old Testament. Most of the apostolic epistles, moreover, were, like the gospels, addressed not to single individuals, but to a whole congregation or to several congregations, as appears from 1 Thess. v. 27 and Col. iv. 16, and were originally designed to be used in public worship. They took the place of the oral preaching of the apostles, and became of course doubly important, when their authors passed off the stage.

3. *Prayer*, which bears the same relation to faith, as exhalation to inhalation, is indispensable to the maintaining and promoting not only of individual piety, but also of the religious life of the congregation and its direct intercourse with the God of all grace and mercy. It expresses itself partly in supplication of temporal

and spiritual blessings ; partly in intercession for all classes and conditions of man, first for fellow-Christians and then for those who are without, even for enemies and persecutors ; and finally in thanksgiving for all benefits received, especially for redemption through Christ.¹ That which gives prayer its peculiarly Christian character, and secures an answer in all cases, though not always in the form desired by the suppliant, yet frequently in one altogether unexpected and in fact much better, is its being offered in the name of Jesus, that is, in perfect submission to the holy will of the Lord, and in the spirit of childlike, unconditional, and unwavering confidence (John xvi. 24 ; Matth. xxi. 22). The apostolical Christians united in prayer previous to entering upon any important business, as the election of the new apostle (Acts i. 24) and of the deacons (vi. 6), at the sending out of Paul and Barnabas into the heathen world (xiii. 3), also in times of need and danger, -as during the imprisonment of Peter, when the church at Jerusalem “made prayer without ceasing unto God for him” (xii. 5), at parting, as when Paul took leave of the elders of Ephesus (xx. 36), after the experience of divine aid, as after the liberation of the apostles from prison, in which case the psalm-like thanksgiving is reported to us, with a statement of its striking effect (iv. 24–31). With prayer was often united fasting, as a means of promoting devotion,² though it is nowhere in the New Testament strictly enjoined as an indispensable duty (comp. Matth. ix. 15).

In general the pastors prayed in the name of all,³ and the congregation testified its concurrence and priestly co-operation after the Jewish custom by an audible amen (1 Cor. xiv. 16).

That the first Christians besides pouring forth in prayer the free effusions of the heart, one of which is given us in Acts iv.

¹ Comp. Acts ii. 42 ; vi. 4 ; xvi. 16. Rom. xii. 12. Phil. iv. 6. 1 Tim. ii. 1, where four kinds of prayer are enumerated (δεήσεις, petitions particularly for the averting of evil ; προσευχαί, petitions for favours from God ; ἐντεύξεις, intercessions ; εὐχαριστία, thanksgiving) ; James v. 15, *et seq.* 1 Peter iv. 8 ; iii. 12. Rev. v. 8 ; viii. 3.

² Acts xiii. 2, 3 ; xiv. 23, at the election of congregational officers ; comp. 1 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Cor. vi. 5. Matth. xvii. 21.

³ In Acts iv. 24 it is said, indeed, of the congregation : Ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἤραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ εἶπον. But by this is unquestionably to be understood, that one gave expression to the thoughts and feelings of all, and in this case that person was no doubt Peter, as may be inferred from the term *παῖς* twice applied to Jesus, verses 27, 30 ; comp. Acts iii. 13, 26.

24, *et seq.*, and which corresponded to the circumstances of each particular occasion, also used standing forms, is nowhere told us, indeed, in the New Testament, but is probable from the analogy of Jewish usage, and from the most natural view of Matth. vi. 9; Luke xi. 1, 2. At all events, it was the opinion of the oldest church fathers, that Christ intended to give His disciples in the Lord's Prayer, not only an idea of the true *spirit* of prayer, but at the same time a general *form*, like the baptismal formula in Matth. xxviii. 19, 20.¹ That this model prayer is in fact peculiarly fitted for such a use, no one will deny, who can appreciate its inexhaustible contents, embracing in few words the whole compass of religious wants.

Respecting the posture in prayer we find nothing prescribed. In the cases of our Lord's agony in Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 41), of Peter's prayer before the raising of Tabitha (Acts ix. 40), and of the sorrowful parting of Paul and the Ephesian elders (xx. 36), kneeling is mentioned. And this is best suited to express that, which here of course has chief prominence, viz., the humble submission and reverence of the heart before the holy God, and the sense of entire dependence on Him; while the erect posture and the lifting up of the hands (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 8) are peculiarly proper for thanksgiving and the expression of solemn joy, and were accordingly used in the ancient church on Sunday, the joyous day of the Lord's resurrection.²

4. The *song* is in reality distinguished from prayer, particularly from thanksgiving, only by its form, its stately garb of poetry, its elevated language of festival enthusiasm, on the wings of which the congregation rises to the highest pitch of devotion, and joins in the celestial harmonies of saints and angels. Thus we have

¹ The testimonies of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen place the universal use of the Lord's Prayer by the church, at least in the second and third centuries, beyond all doubt. Comp. on this point Augusti: *Handbuch des christl. Archäol.*, vol. ii. p. 62, *et seq.*

² Calvin on the *θεῖς τὰ γόνατα*, Acts xx. 36, finely observes, respecting these forms—"Primus quidem in precibus obtinet interior affectus, sed externa signa, genuflexio, capitis relectio, manuum levatio, duplicem habent usum. Prior est, ut membra omnia exerceamus in Dei gloriam et cultum; deinde ut hoc quasi adminiculo exercitetur nostra pigritia. Accedit in solenni et publica precatatione tertius usus, quia pietatem suam hoc modo profitentur filii Dei, et alii alios mutuo accendunt ad Dei reverentiam. Sicut autem manuum levatio fiducia et ardentis desiderii symbolum est, ita humilitatis testandae causa in genua procumbimus."

here the two noblest and most spiritual arts—music and poetry, consecrated to religion; as in fact all art is destined ultimately to become worship, and to minister to the praise of God, from whom it proceeds, and to the delight of His people. The song passed immediately from the temple and synagogue into the Christian church along with the Psalms; as the doxologies, antiphonies, collects, and the whole psalmody of Eastern and Western antiquity show. The Lord himself sang with His disciples at the institution of the holy supper (Matth. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26), probably the hallelujah Psalms (cxiii.—cxviii.) used at the Jewish Passover; thus consecrating the singing of psalms as an act of the new Christian worship. Paul (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16) expressly enjoins the use of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, for social edification. The Christians employed song also privately and in small circles, as appears from the advice of James (v. 13): “Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms;” and from the fact (Acts xvi. 25), that Paul and Silas at midnight, in the dark dungeon, joined in a hymn to the Lord, and thus rose above their troubles and pain.

The Psalms of the Old Testament, which in the light of their fulfilment in the New are even to this day an inexhaustible source of edification and spiritual refreshment, were undoubtedly the first used by the apostolic churches, especially by the Jewish Christians. But besides these, even in that period, particularly among the Gentile converts, peculiarly Christian songs sprang forth from the inspiration of the first love, like flowers beneath the vernal sun.¹ Several sections of the Gospel of Luke, which in its first two chapters is highly poetical and liturgical, passed, perhaps, as early as the first century, into public use as songs; the anthem of the heavenly hosts, for instance (Luke ii. 14, the so-called “Gloria”), the parting words of Simeon (ii. 29, the “Nunc dimittis”), the sublime songs of Mary (i. 46, *et seq.*, the “Magnificat”), and Zacharias (i. 68, *et seq.*, the “Benedictus”). The short thanksgiving in Acts iv. 24–30 has a psalmodic character (comp. Psalm ii.), and is easily put into metrical form. In all probability, too, the epistles in several instances contain fragments of such primitive Christian songs; as is indicated by

¹ Perhaps these Christian songs are intended by the “hymns and spiritual songs,” Eph. v. 19, in distinction from the “psalms.”

the poetical, and sometimes metrical, form of expression. See, for example, Eph. v. 14;¹ 1 Tim. iii. 16 (especially if, according to the best authorities, we here read *ὅς*; for this reading is most naturally explained on the supposition of the passage being a fragment of a hymn, which, in six parallel stanzas in melodious rhythm, contains a christology *in nuce*); 2 Tim. ii. 11 (where the *γάρ* indicates a quotation, and the parallel and rhythmical structure of the passage a poetical quotation); and James i. 17 (where the words from *πᾶσα* to *τέλειον* form a hexameter). Then the Apocalypse contains a number of lyric pieces, songs of the glorified saints in praise of the Lamb, which breathe upon us the peaceful air of eternity. This whole book is full of doxologies and antiphonies.² Finally, as we have already seen, speaking with tongues, according to Paul's description, was nothing but a peculiar kind of prayer and song in the language of ecstatic inspiration.³

5. All the acts of worship now mentioned are at the same time *confessions of faith*. Whether there was besides these a special confession—say at baptism—we shall consider in the following section, in which we take up the last element of worship, the administration of the sacraments.

§ 142. *Baptism. (Note on Immersion.)*

6. Finally, an essential constituent of the Christian worship is the administration of the *sacraments*. These are sacred acts, by which, on the ground of an express command of Christ, under visible signs an invisible grace is not only represented, but also communicated and sealed to the worthy recipients.⁴ They are

¹ On this quotation Stier well remarks (*Comment.* I. p. 285), after refuting the erroneous references of it to several passages of Isaiah—"The apostle here quotes, with as much honour as Scripture, from a hymn-book then existing distinct from the Bible, the words of a liturgical song, which flowed from the Scriptures and the Spirit—the prophetic Spirit, which reigned in the church." Theodoret already gives it as the opinion of several interpreters, that Paul, in Eph. v. 14, quotes a fragment of a hymn.

² Comp. Rev. i. 4-8; v. 9-14; xi. 15-19; xv. 3, *et seq.*; xxi. 1-8; xxii. 10-17, 20.

³ Α *προσεύχεσθαι*, or *ψάλλειν τῷ πνεύματι*, 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16; comp. above, § 117.

⁴ The term *sacrament*, by which the Vulgate frequently translates the Greek *μυστήριον*, *mystery* (as in Eph. iii. 3, 9; v. 32. Rev. i. 20; xvii. 7), was received into the theological language of the church from the time of Tertullian; but the compass of the conception, and consequently the number of the sacraments, long remained very indefinite. Catholics and Protestants agree in requiring three elements for a *sacramentum* in the strict sense; a *signum visibile*, a *gratia invisibilis*, and a *mandatum*

baptism and the *Lord's Supper*. These in the New Testament take the place of their Old Testament types, circumcision and the paschal feast, as efficacious signs, pledges, and means of grace. They are related to one another in general as regeneration and sanctification, as the rise and the growth of the Christian life. The supper, therefore, is to be repeated; baptism is not.

Baptism, which our Lord instituted at His departure from the earth,¹ meets us in the Christian form on the first Pentecost in intimate connection with the preaching of the gospel. As to its *nature* and *import*, it appears as the church-founding sacrament and the outward medium of the forgiveness of sins and the communication of the Holy Ghost (Acts ii. 38). It is the solemn ceremony of reception and incorporation into the communion of the visible church and of Jesus Christ, its Head. Hence Paul calls it a putting on of Christ (Gal. iii. 11), a union into one body by one Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 13), a washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Titus iii. 5), comp. John iii. 5), a being buried with Christ and rising again with Him to a new and holy life (Rom. vi. 4). In its idea, therefore, and divine intent, baptism coincides with regeneration. It marks the beginning of the renewing work of the Holy Ghost, who is fitly symbolized by the pure and purifying water. In practice, however, the outward act is not always accompanied by the inward change. And in this case the general principles hold, that the exception does not set aside, but confirms, the rule, and that the unfaithfulness of man cannot subvert the faithfulness of God. The communication of the promised sacramental grace is not magical or mechanical, but is dependent, as well in baptism as in the supper, on certain conditions, viz., a scriptural mode of administration on the part of the officiating minister, and repentance and faith on the part of the recipient. Where the latter condition is wanting, the blessing turns into a curse. The sacrament is accordingly, like the word of God, a saviour of life

divinum; but the former find these three elements in *seven* sacred usages of the church; the latter only in baptism and the Lord's Supper, because in the Protestant view a *mandatum divinum* is not constituted by the mere judgment of the church, but requires an express command of Christ or His apostles in the words of Scripture.

¹ Matt. xxviii. 19. Comp. Mark xvi. 16. John iii. 5.

unto life to believers, but to the unworthy a savour of death unto death (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 29). In Acts viii. 13, 16, 18, *et seq.*), we have in the hypocrite, Simon Magus, an example of a merely outward baptism with water, without the inward baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire; while, on the other hand, Cornelius and his company received the Holy Spirit in the midst of Peter's sermon before they were baptized (x. 44, *et seq.*) Nevertheless, in this last case the outward act was added, and that not as an empty ceremony, but as the objective confirmation and divine seal of the grace received. Though God is absolutely free, and though His Spirit blows as and whither it will (John iii. 8), yet is the church bound by His ordinances, and therefore adheres with good reason to the principle, that baptism—of course not without faith—is in general necessary to salvation; while, on the other hand, she asserts with the same right, that not the defect of the sacrament (which may be the result of unavoidable circumstances, as in the case of the penitent thief on the cross, or of a conversion in an unwatered desert), but the conscious contempt of it, condemns. Both these principles are involved in our Lord's expressions, John iii. 5, where He represents the being born again of water and the Spirit as the indispensable condition of entrance into the kingdom of God; and Mark xvi. 16, where He pronounces not the baptized as such, but only the believing recipients of baptism, saved, and not the unbaptized as such, but only the unbelieving, damned: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

The full *formula* of baptism, as prescribed by Christ (Matth. xxviii. 19), is in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; signifying a sinking of the subject into the revealed being of the triune God, a coming into living communion with Him, so as thenceforth to be consecrated to Him, to live to Him and serve Him, and to experience His blessed redeeming and sanctifying power. In practice, however, we find the apostles always using the abbreviated form: "into the name," or "in the name of Jesus Christ," or "of the Lord Jesus," or simply "into Christ."¹ Of course this included the other, binding the

¹ Acts ii. 38; x. 48; xix. 5. Rom. vi. 3. Gal. iii. 27.

subject to receive the whole doctrine of Christ, and consequently what He had taught concerning the Father and the Holy Ghost.¹

The act of baptism was preceded by brief *instruction* respecting the main facts of the Gospel history, and an injunction of repentance and faith in Jesus as the promised Messiah and the Saviour of the world. But the more thorough indoctrination in the apostolic truth came after.² Subsequently, when the reception of proselytes demanded great caution, the time of instruction and probation was extended.

It was probably the custom even in the times of the apostles to require of the candidate, before administering the holy ordinance, a simple *confession* of his penitent faith in Jesus Christ. Of this we have hints in Acts viii. 37, where the eunuch, before being baptized, answered to Philip's question: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;"³ in 1 Peter iii. 21, where the apostle says of baptism, that it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh (like common washings), but the answer of a good conscience toward God (*συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν*)," referring to the questions and answers of the solemn contract of the candidate with God;⁴ and finally, in 1 Tim. vi. 12, where

¹ Others think that these passages do not contain the baptismal formula at all, but only thus briefly designate the Christian baptism in distinction from the baptism of John, and perhaps from the baptism administered to Jewish proselytes (*i.e.* if this is as old as the Christian era; which is well known to be doubtful, as no older testimony exists for it than that of the Gemara). This suits Acts xix. 5 very well. It is certain that immediately after the time of the apostles the formula given by Christ was in general use (comp. *e.g.* Justin's *Apol.* I. 80), but also that the abridged form, in the sense above given, was acknowledged valid as far down as the third century (comp. Neander, *Kirchengesch.* I. 535, and especially Höfling, *Das Sacrament der Taufe*, etc. I. p. 37, *et seq.*

² Comp. Acts ii. 41, 42; viii. 12, 36, *et seq.*; ix. 19; x. 34-48. Heb. vi. 1, *et seq.*

³ It must be observed, however, that in the oldest codices, A B C (D has a chasm here), and in several versions, this verse is wanting, and has hence been suspected as a later interpolation.

⁴ Ἐπερώτημα, properly *question*, may by metonymy (like the Latin *interrogatio* in Seneca, *De benef.* III. 15) signify either *sponsio*, *promissio*, as this was called forth by the question of the minister, or both together, the whole catechetical process and solemn engagement. Winer explains it—inquiry after God, *i.e.* a turning to God—but then we should rather expect ἐπερώτησις. Comp. the commentaries, and Neander, *Apostelgesch.* I. p. 277. It is possible, however, that the ἐπερώτημα contains an allusion to the high-priest's inquiring of God through the breastplate, with which, after washing himself, he went into the sanctuary. Taken then as met. consequentis pro causa, the term would mean—Qualification for inquiring of God, for free access to God.

many commentators, following Chrysostom, refer the good profession before many witnesses," of which Paul reminds Timothy, to his baptism; while to others these words suggest a solemn vow at ordination to the pastoral office. The first confession of Peter (Matth. xvi. 16), and then the baptismal formula itself (xxviii. 19) would very naturally be taken as the basis of this baptismal confession, and from it grew in the course of the second and third centuries, in a truly organic way, and from the consciousness not of an individual, but of the whole church, the so-called Apostles' Creed. This symbol, though not in form the production of the apostles, is a faithful compend of their doctrine; comprehends the leading articles of the faith in the triune God and His revelation, from the creation to the life everlasting, in sublime simplicity, in unsurpassable brevity, in the most beautiful order, and with liturgical solemnity; and to this day is the common bond of Greek, Roman, and Evangelical Christendom.

Baptism, being the sacrament of regeneration, cannot, in the nature of the case, be repeated, any more than the natural birth. The re-baptism of the disciples of John, Acts xix. 5, is not a case in point. For these persons had received only the baptism of John, which could not impart the Holy Ghost (comp. ver. 2), and after the first Christian Pentecost lost even its provisional significance. Nor, on the other hand, can it be inferred from this fact, that the apostles also were re-baptized; for in their case the outward act was compensated for by the miraculous baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire on the day of Pentecost (comp. Acts i. 5.) The earlier baptism of the disciples (John iv. 2), previous to the glorification of Christ, and therefore before the Holy Ghost was given (John vii. 39), was not essentially different from John's baptism of repentance. The peculiarly Christian baptism first appeared at the founding of the church on the day of Pentecost.

Finally, as to the outward *mode* of administering this ordinance; immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, used to designate the rite. Then again, by the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed *in* the Jordan (ἐν, Matth. iii. 6, compare 16;

also εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, Mark i. 9.) Furthermore by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 2), with the flood (1 Peter iii. 21), with a bath (Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5), with a burial and resurrection (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12). Finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was always immersion (as it is to this day in the Oriental and also the Graeco-Russian churches); pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death.¹

NOTE.—It may be proper here to add a note on the disputed question of *immersion* and *sprinkling*. βαπτίζω (εἰς τι, ἐν τι, also πρὸς τι)—the frequentative of βάπτω, but synonymous with it, except that the latter, besides the sense “to immerse,” has the derivative one “to colour”—denotes in the classics, not by any means every mode of *applicatio aquæ*, thus including *infusio* and *aspersio*, regardless of the quantitative relation of the water to the object, to which it is applied; but always an entire or partial *immersio*. Compare on this point the classical lexicons, and especially the full exhibition of this philological argument by the learned Baptist divine, Dr Alex. Carson: *Baptism in its Mode and Subjects*, chap. ii., p. 18–168 (5th Amer. ed. 1850). The advocates of the mode of baptism by sprinkling urge against the Baptists the following exegetical points:—

1. In the later *Hellenistic* usage, and therefore in the LXX. and N. T., βαπτίζειν sometimes has the general sense “to wash,” “to cleanse.” (So also Dr Robinson in the new edition of his *Gr. and Engl. Lexicon*, p. 118). In support of this a confident appeal can assuredly be made to several passages, viz. Luke xi. 38 (comp. with Mark vii. 2–4), where βαπτίζειν is used of the washing of hands before eating (Mark has for this, ver. 3, νίπτειν τὰς χεῖρας), which in the East was performed by pouring (comp. 2 Kings iii. 11); Mark vii. 4, 8, which speaks of βαπτισμοί, i.e. cleansing of cups, pitchers, and tables; Heb. ix. 10, where the διάφοροι βαπτισμοί must be taken to include all sorts of religious purifications among the Jews, bathing (Lev. xiv. .

¹ Indeed some would not allow even this baptismus clinicorum, as it was called, to be valid baptism; and Cyprian himself, in the third century, ventured to defend the *aspersio* only in case of a *necessitas cogens*, and with reference to a special *indulgentia Dei* (*Ep.* 76 *ad Magn.* Comp. Höfling, l. c. I. p. 48, *et seq.*) There were ecclesiastical laws which made persons baptized by sprinkling ineligible to church offices. These were grounded, however, not so much in the notion of the imperfection of their baptism, as in the fact, that they frequently received it from fear of approaching death, and hence might not have been so thoroughly prepared for it as others. Not till the end of the thirteenth century did sprinkling become the rule and immersion the exception; partly from the gradual decrease in the number of adult baptisms partly from considerations of health and convenience—all children having now come to be treated as infirmi.

Num. xix. 7), washing (Num. xix. 7 ; Mark vii. 8), and sprinkling (Lev. xiv. 7 ; Num. xix. 19) ; the figurative phrase βαπτ. ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, Matth. iii. 11 ; Luke iii. 16 ; Mark i. 8 ; John i. 33 ; Acts i. 5 ; xi. 16, where the notion of immersion is hardly admissible, as the Holy Ghost is rather poured out ; finally, several passages of the LXX., as 2 Kings v. 14, 10 (where βαπτ. is synonymous with λούειν), Judith xii. 7 (καὶ ἐβαπτίζετο ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος). It must be conceded, however, that in all these cases at least a copious application of water is intended, as the design of the ablution requires a wetting of the whole object.

2. The improbability of 3000 persons during the feast of Pentecost (Acts ii. 41), and soon after 5000 (iv. 4), having been baptized by immersion at Jerusalem in one day, since there is no water in the neighbourhood of the city in summer but the springs and the brook Siloam, and the houses are supplied from cisterns and public reservoirs, so that there, as in all Palestine, private baths in dwellings are very rare. In these cases we must give up, it would seem, the idea at least of a total immersion, and substitute perhaps that of a copious affusion upon the head.

3. Dr Robinson, l. c. and in his *Bibl. Researches in Palest.* II. 182, III. 78, further adduces, that the baptismal fonts found among the ruins of the oldest Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Cophna, are not large enough for the immersion of adults, and were evidently not intended for that purpose.

These arguments assuredly serve in some measure to justify from exegesis the now prevalent form of baptism by affusion. Yet the ordinary use of βαπτίζειν, βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, in connection with the passages respecting baptism adduced in the text, the clear testimonies of antiquity, and the present prevailing usage of the Oriental churches, puts it beyond all doubt, that entire or partial immersion was the general rule in Christian antiquity, from which certainly nothing but urgent outward circumstances caused a deviation. Respecting the *form* of baptism, therefore (quite otherwise with the much more important difference respecting the *subject* of baptism, or *infant* baptism, comp. § 143), the impartial historian is compelled by exegesis and history substantially to yield the point to the Baptists, as is done in fact (perhaps somewhat too decidedly and without due regard to the arguments just stated for the other practice) by most German scholars, *e. g.* Neander : *Apostelgesch.* I. p. 276 ; Knapp : *Vorlesungen über die christliche Glaubenslehre*, II. p. 453 ; Höfling : l. c. I. p. 46 *et seq.* ; also by the Anglican divines, Conybeare and Howson, who make a candid confession, *Life of St Paul*, I. 471 : “It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret, that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our Northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages

of Scripture.” With this we entirely concur. It is well known, that the reformers, Luther and Calvin, and several old Protestant liturgies, gave the preference to immersion; and this is undoubtedly far better suited than sprinkling to symbolize the idea of baptism, the entire purifying of the inward man, the being buried and the rising again with Christ. But the Baptists go too far in making immersion, after the fashion of Jewish legalism, the *only* valid form of baptism. The application of *water* is indeed necessary to this sacrament; but the quantity of it, as also the quality (whether sea, spring, or river water, whether cold or warm), is certainly not essential. Otherwise we should in fact bind the efficacy of the Holy Ghost to what is material and accidental. Here difference of climate, state of health, and other circumstances, may certainly claim some regard; and hence the ancient church made exceptions at least in reference to sick catechumens and children, and applied to them the water by sprinkling.

§ 143. *Infant Baptism.*

In consequence of the missionary character of the apostolic church adult baptism in this period predominated. Infant baptism can have no significance, save on the ground of a mother church already existing, and in view of a Christian education, which heathen and Jewish parents of course can not be expected to give. So also at this day, a missionary will not begin his work with baptizing children, but with instructing adults.

But here arises the question: Was there not at that day, in churches already established, along with the baptism of adults, which in the nature of the case was most frequent, a Christian infant baptism, corresponding to its type, circumcision, which, administered first to the patriarch Abraham as the seal of his righteousness of faith (comp. Rom iv. 11), was immediately afterwards performed on his son, Isaac, on the eighth day after his birth (Gen. xxi. 4), and made the sign of the covenant for all his male posterity (Gen. xvii. 10, *et seq.*)? This question we must answer decidedly in the affirmative, though we here encounter not only the Baptists, but also the authority of many celebrated pedo-baptist divines, and among them the venerable Dr Neander, who denies the existence of infant baptism in the apostolic church.¹ It is very often asserted, indeed, even by friends of

¹ *Apostelgesch.* I. 278, *et seq.* Here, however, we must not overlook the essential difference, that, while the Baptists pronounce infant baptism an unscriptural and unchristian innovation, Neander, on the contrary, represents it as proceeding from

infant baptism, that no direct authority for it can be shown in the New Testament, not excepting the passages in Acts, where the baptism of whole families is spoken of, as ch. x. 2, 44-48; xvi. 15, 30-33; xviii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15. In none of these places, it is said, are children expressly mentioned, and the families concerned might possibly have consisted entirely of adults. But this is, even in itself, exceedingly improbable, since we have here, not one case only, but five, and these given merely as examples, whence we may readily infer that there were many others. A glance at any neighbourhood will show, that families without children are the exceptions, not the rule. But besides, it is hardly conceivable, that all the supposed adult sons and daughters in these five cases so quickly determined on going over with their parents to a despised and persecuted religious society; whereas, if we suppose the children to have been still young and therefore entirely under paternal authority, the matter presents no difficulty at all. Moreover we need not insist on any particular passage. We here rest the case, rather, as we must do with so many other articles of faith, even the doctrine of the Trinity, mainly on the whole tone and spirit of the Holy Scriptures, which involve infinitely more than the letter directly declares. And if it can be proved, that infant baptism holds a necessary place in the entire structure and design of apostolical Christianity, we may certainly infer from this with tolerable confidence, in the utter want of evidence to the contrary, that it was actually practised.

The ultimate authority for infant baptism in the bosom of a regular Christian community and under a sufficient guarantee of pious education—for only on these terms do we advocate it—lies in the *universal import of Christ's person and work*, which extends as far as humanity itself. Christ is not only able, but willing, to save mankind of all classes, in all circumstances, of both sexes, and at all stages of life, and consequently to provide for all these the necessary means of grace (comp. Gal. iii. 28). Before the Saviour of the world these distinctions are all lost in the common need and capability of redemption. A Christ, able and willing to save none but adults, would be no such Christ as the gospel

the genuine spirit of Christianity, though not till towards the end of the second century.

presents. The exclusion of a part of our race from the blessings of the kingdom of heaven on account of age has not the slightest warrant in the Holy Scriptures, and our noblest impulses, our deepest religious feelings, rise against such a particularism.¹ In the significant parallel, Rom. v. 12, *et seq.*, the apostle earnestly presses the point, that the reign of righteousness and life is in its divine intent and intrinsic efficacy fully as comprehensive as the reign of sin and death, to which children among the rest are subject; nay, far more comprehensive and availing; and that the blessing and gain by the second Adam far outweigh the curse and the loss by the first. Hence he emphatically repeats the “much more” (πολλῶ μᾶλλον) in the second clause (verses 15, 17). The church, like Christ himself, is above all limitations of nation, language, sex, or age. The parable of the leaven (Matth. xiii. 33) penetrating and pervading the whole mass, is expressly intended to illustrate the power of the kingdom of God to work in, and diffuse itself through all the relations and conditions of life; and when the Lord, after solemnly declaring, that all power is given to Him in heaven and in earth, commands His apostles to make *all nations* disciples (μαθητεύειν) by baptism in the triune Name and by instruction in His doctrine, there is not the least reason for limiting this to those of maturer age. Or do nations consist only of men, and not of youth also, and children? According to Psalm cxvii. 1, “all nations,” and according to Psalm

¹ And yet this is the inevitable consequence, nay, in fact the principle, of the Baptist theory. Dr Alexander Carson, its most learned advocate, openly declares (*Baptism in its Mode and Subjects*, p. 173), that children cannot be saved by the Gospel nor by faith: “The Gospel has nothing to do with infants, nor have Gospel ordinances any respect to them. The Gospel has to do with those who hear it. It is good news; but to infants it is no news at all. They know nothing of it. The salvation of the Gospel is as much confined to believers, as the baptism of the Gospel is. None can ever be saved by the Gospel who do not believe it. Consequently by the Gospel no infant can be saved.” When, however, the Baptists suppose, as they commonly do, that infants are saved, and saved without baptism, without faith, without the Gospel, they reject the fundamental principle of the Gospel, that out of Christ there is no salvation, that faith in Him alone can save. “Infants who enter heaven,” says Carson, l. c., “must be regenerated, but not by the Gospel. Infants must be sanctified for heaven, but not through the truth as revealed to man.” (Is there then another truth besides the revealed; and could this be anything else than an untruth; and can such an extra and anti-evangelical truth save?) “We know nothing of the means by which God receives infants; nor have we any business with it.” Fine consolation for Christian parents, especially at the grave of their beloved child!

cl. 6, "everything that hath breath," should praise the Lord; and that these include babes and sucklings, is explicitly told us in Psalm viii. 2, and Matth. xxi. 16.

With this is closely connected the beautiful idea, already clearly brought out by Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, and the faithful medium of the apostolical tradition descending from John's field of labour—the idea that Jesus Christ became for children a child, for youth a youth, for men a man, and by thus entering into the various conditions and stages of our earthly existence sanctified every period of life, infancy as well as manhood.¹ The Baptist view robs the Saviour's *infancy* of its profound and cheering significance.

If now Christ is really the Saviour of infants as well as of adults, the means of this salvation must be available for both. Christ can not will an end without willing at the same time the way which leads to it; and we must therefore either deny baptism as a means of saving grace, or grant it to all whom Christ would save, if the proper conditions are at hand.

Most certainly, however, is *faith* necessary on our part, as the indispensable condition of salvation, the organ by which we appropriate Christ and receive His blessings; and here we meet the main exegetical and dogmatical argument of the Baptists. Christian baptism, say they, requires the gospel to have been preached to the subject, and the subject to have exercised repentance and faith; but infants can neither understand a sermon, nor repent and believe; therefore neither can they be baptized. The major premise is in the main correct; the minor is, in such a broad application, false; hence the conclusion falls to the ground. The connection of baptism with preaching and with faith is placed beyond dispute by the words of the institution of this sacrament,

¹ "Omnes enim," says Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.* III. 22, with a profound view of the mystery of the incarnation, "per semetipsum venit salvare, omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pucros et juvenes et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit aetatem et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes, in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiæ et subjectionis, in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens et sanctificans Domino." That Irenæus, in the words "renascuntur in Deum" has in mind baptism as the sacrament of regeneration, whereby even the infant is consecrated to God, is conceded by Neander in his *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i. p. 537, where he says of this expression of the church father: "Thus from this idea, which lay deep in the essence of Christianity, and ruled all minds, proceeded the practice of infant baptism."

Matth xxviii. 19, and especially Mark xvi. 16—"He that (first) believeth and (then) is baptized, shall be saved;"¹ and by the examples in the book of Acts, according to which the act of baptism was always preceded by the preaching of the missionaries and the faith of the hearers.² But even here we have to consider what the Baptists overlook, that in all these cases the instruction, which preceded this rite of initiation into the church, was very brief and general, touching only the main facts of Gospel history, and accompanied, therefore, by only a small degree of faith; and that the complete communication of the apostle's doctrine, and growth in the faith, took place after the person was in full communion with the church. The primitive Christian baptism was neither a forced act, like the baptism of the Saxons, for instance, at the order of Charlemagne, nor a ceremony in the usual Baptist sense, which imparts nothing new at all, but merely seals the faith already possessed. The apostles never demanded full and formal regeneration *before* baptism, but simply an honest longing for salvation in Christ; which salvation was then actually administered and sealed to them by baptism, and afterwards nourished and developed by the other means of grace. "Repent," says Peter to the three thousand, who were baptized on the day of Pentecost after anxiously listening to one short sermon, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;" thus placing these two blessings, the negative and the positive, the remission of sins and the bestowment of the Spirit, as the effect, not the condition, of baptism. This view is corroborated by the oft mistaken passage, Matth. xxviii. 19, which, to give the true sense, should be translated, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples (*μαθητεύσατε*) of all nations (by) baptizing them (*βαπτίζοντες*) in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, (and by) teaching them (*διδάσκοντες*) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Here plainly the

¹ Or more accurately: "Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit," as the Vulgate translates the original.

² Acts ii. 37, *et seq.*; viii. 5, *et seq.*; 35-38; ix. 17, *et seq.*; x. 42-48; xvi. 15, 33; xviii. 8; xix. 5. Full use is made of these passages in the Baptist sense by R. Pengilly: *The Scripture Guide to Baptism*, p. 27, *et seq.* ed. of Philadelphia, 1849 (also translated into German); and by Js. Taylor Hinton; *History of Baptism from inspired and uninspired Writings* (Philad. 1846), ch. III. p. 88, *et seq.*

“making disciples” (of Jesus, *i.e.* true Christians) is not one and the same with the “teaching,”¹ but a more general idea, denoting the object to be attained by the double means, first of baptism, and then of teaching.² Were it possible to be a complete Christian before baptism, therefore out of the church, baptism were useless, or at least unnecessary. And to this the Baptist theory virtually comes.³ It always more or less mistakes the nature and the pedagogical character of the church, as an indispensable saving and sanctifying institution, and regards it in reality merely as a community of the saved. Besides the demand of regeneration and conversion, as a necessary prerequisite for baptism, makes the latter, properly speaking, impossible, or indefinitely postpones it; for God has not endowed the ministers or congregations with the gift of infallible discernment of spirits. Even a Philip was deceived by the hypocritical profession of Simon Magus.

But now, as to the second proposition of the Baptist argument, the incapacity of children for faith, whence follows their exclusion from baptism: this is granted, if by faith we understand a *self-conscious, free* turning of the heart to God. This cannot take place till the dawn of intelligence (for which, by the way, no certain period can be fixed), and in view of this infant baptism needs to be completed in the subject, according to ancient custom, by catechetical instruction and by confirmation, in which the Christian, arrived at the age of spiritual discretion, ratifies his baptismal confession, and of his free determination gives himself to God. For this reason also the baptism of the children of unbelieving, though nominally Christian, parents, is in reality unmeaning, or rather a profanation of the holy transaction; since there is here a hypocritical profession of faith, and no guarantee of an education answering to the baptismal vow. But the grand error of the proposition before us is, that the conception of faith in general, and with it the agency of the Holy Ghost, is limited

¹ Luther's translation of this is inaccurate, and calculated to mislead; he renders μαθητεύειν also by “lehren,” to teach. So also the common English version.

² Not without reason, therefore, says the Danish divine, Dr H. Martensen (*Die christl. Taufe und die baptistische Frage*, Hamburg, 1843, p. 24): “The more infant baptism prevails in the world, the more are the words of the Lord fulfilled, that *the nations* should be made disciples by baptism and teaching.”

³ With the exception of the “Disciples of Christ,” or “Campbellites,” who identify immersion with regeneration.

to, and made to depend on, a particular stage in the development of the human mind, and that the various forms and phases of divine operation and of faith are overlooked. The ground and the conditions of salvation lie not at all in the subject or creature, but in the depths of the divine mercy; and in faith itself we must observe different stages, from the germ to the perfect fruit. The Holy Scriptures speak of a little and weak faith,¹ of a growing, a strong, and a firmly rooted faith,² of a struggling and overcoming faith,³ and of a perfected faith.⁴ Faith begins with religious susceptibility, with an unconscious longing for the divine, and a childlike trust in a higher power. It is not a product of human thought, understanding, feeling, or will, but a work of grace and of the Spirit of God, who is bound to no age or degree of intelligence, but operates, as the wind blows, when and where He will.⁵ Faith does not produce the blessings of salvation, but simply receives them, and only in this aspect, as a receptive, not a productive organ, is it saving; otherwise salvation would be the work of the creature.

Now this receptivity for the divine, or faith in its incipient form and slumbering germ, may be found in the child, even purer than in the adult. In virtue of its religious constitution and endowments, the child is susceptible to the influences of grace, and may be actually regenerated. If a man deny this, he must, to be consistent, condemn all children without exception to perdition. For they, like all men, are conceived in sin (Psalm li. 5), flesh born of flesh (John iii. 6), and by nature children of wrath (Eph. ii. 3; comp. Rom. iii. 22–24); and except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, according to our Lord's unequivocal declaration, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (John iii. 5). "He that believed not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16). When Baptist, and some other theologians, therefore, admit at least some infants into heaven without regeneration or faith, they either deny original sin and guilt, after the manner of Pelagianism, or open a way of salvation unknown,

¹ Matth. xvii. 20. Luke xxii. 31, *et seq.*

² 2 Thess. i. 3. 1 Cor. xvi. 13. Col. ii. 7.

³ 1 Tim. vi. 12. Eph. vi. 10. 1 John v. 4.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 7, *et seq.*

⁵ Comp. such passages as Rom. xii. 3. Gal. v. 5. 1 Cor. xii. 3, 9. 2 Cor. iv. 13. Eph. ii. 8. Col. ii. 12. Phil. i. 29. John iii. 8.

nay, directly opposed, to the Gospel. There are also, however, explicit passages in the Scriptures, which leave no doubt respecting the capacity of childhood and infancy for the divine. Not to mention the extraordinary case of John the Baptist, who even in his mother's womb was filled with the Holy Ghost (Luke i. 15, 41), we know from Matth. xviii. 2-5; xix. 14, 15: Mark x. 14, 15: Luke xviii. 16, 17, that the Saviour himself took children into His arms, blessed them, and adjudged them meet for the kingdom of heaven; nay, He required all adults to become children again, to cultivate the simple, unassuming, confiding, susceptible disposition of the child, if they would have part in that kingdom. Should the church refuse baptism, that is the sign and seal of entrance into Christ's kingdom, to the tender age, which the Lord himself pressed to His loving heart? Should she hold off from her communion as incapable and unworthy the infants, whom the Head of the church presented even as models to all who would be His disciples? Rather must we conclude from this, strange as it may appear, that *every baptism, even in the case of adults, is really an infant baptism*; because Christ makes the childlike spirit an indispensable condition of entrance into His kingdom, and because baptism in general, as the sacrament of regeneration, demands of every candidate the renunciation of his former sinful life in repentance, and the beginning of a *new*, holy life in faith.

All the objections, which are made against the Christian baptism of infants, are of equal force against the Jewish institution of *circumcision* on the eighth day. For this was not an unmeaning ceremony, but a sacred sign and seal of the covenant, admitting the circumcised person to its privileges and blessings, and binding him also under its obligations (comp. Gal. v. 3), which, strictly speaking, he could only assume at the age of discretion and by a voluntary act. As, however, the circumcision of the Israelitish children rested undeniably on a divine command (Gen. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 3), we may draw from this typical rite an inference in favour of infant baptism. For the latter has in some sense taken the place of the former, and hence is called the "circumcision of Christ" (Col. ii. 11); with the grand difference, indeed, that the old covenant with all its institutions was but a shadow of good things to come, while the new covenant of grace

is the antitype and substance (Heb. x. 1; Col. ii. 17). This difference, however, is all in our favour. If the former, according to the promise of Jehovah, Gen. xvii. 7, *et seq.*, embraced the whole posterity of Abraham, much more does the latter, which is in fact distinguished from the other by its very largeness, depth, and fulness. In this comprehensive sense, after the analogy of the ordinance of circumcision, must the apostles, being Jews, have undoubtedly taken the command of the Lord to baptize *all nations*; and had Christ intended to exclude children, He would have somehow signified it. In fact Peter, on the day of Pentecost, in calling upon his hearers to be baptized, explicitly announces this extension of the blessings of the Gospel to children — “For the promise (of the remission of sins and of the Holy Ghost) is unto you, *and to your children*,¹ and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call” (Acts ii. 39).

This important idea of an *organic connection between Christian parents and their children*, by virtue of which the latter are included in the covenant obligations and privileges of the former, meets us also in the apostle Paul. He considers children as already belonging to the church, and requires them to obey their parents “in the Lord” (Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20); which is possible, properly speaking, only on the ground of their vital union with the church, the body of the Lord, and this union is formed by baptism. In 1 Cor. vii. 14, the apostle makes an important distinction between the children of heathen parents and those of Christian, calling the former unclean (*ἀκάθαρα*), but the latter holy (*ἅγια*), by virtue of their organic union with a believing mother or father.² As in a mixed marriage, of which he just before speaks, the power of the divine life in the Christian parent is mightier than the power of darkness in the heathen partner, so also its influence on the offspring is predominant. For God is stronger than Satan. How much greater must be the influence of the divine life over the child when both parents walk in the fear of God and are imbued with the spirit of faith!

¹ If we take this in the wide sense, as meaning posterity in general, still we in no case exclude children.

² In like manner Paul says of the relation of the patriarchs to the Jewish nation, which sprang from them (Rom. xi. 16): “For if the first-fruit be holy, the lump (the bread prepared from the fruit) is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches.”

Paul does not here mean, of course, to deny the natural corruption of the children of Christian parents; but he does unequivocally teach, that the blessing of the covenant is transmitted to them, and the curse of nature so far removed that those who were by nature unholy are by grace consecrated to God and brought under a sanctifying influence. Infant baptism itself is here not expressly mentioned indeed, but the idea and authorization of it is most assuredly implied.¹ For if, by virtue of their birth from believing parents, the children are already included in the covenant of grace, why should they be excluded from the sacrament which puts the divine seal on this covenant and alone makes it, so to speak, valid and available in law? This passage, however, at the same time restricts the right to and the qualification for baptism to those children whose parents, at least on one side, are believers; because it is only in connection with a Christian family that the διδάσκειν, which the command of Christ, Matth. xxviii. 19, annexes to the βαπτίζειν, and consequently the preservation of the baptismal grace and the development of it to the independent life of faith, can be expected.²

John also, like Paul, regards the children of believers as members of the Christian church. After addressing his readers, 1 John ii. 12, as τέκνία, he turns, ver. 13, to those in the several stages of life, fathers, young men, children; and he dwells longest upon the latter (ver. 15), because they are encountering seasons of temptation, and because they are mainly the hope of the church. In his second epistle the same apostle salutes the children of Cyria, and conveys to her a salutation from the children of her sister; nay, in ver. 4 he expresses his joy to find some of Cyria's children walking in the truth; which can be said only

¹ This Neander also virtually concedes, when he says of the above passage (*Apostelgesch.* I. p. 282, *et seq.*): "The view here taken by Paul, though it goes against the actual existence of infant baptism at that time (?), yet includes the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed, and by which it would be justified in the mind of Paul, viz., the idea of a pre-eminence belonging to children born in a Christian communion; of a consecration for the kingdom of God thereby granted them; of an immediate sanctifying influence, to be brought to bear on their earliest development."

² With good reason, therefore, do the so-called *Apostolic constitutions* place infant baptism and *Christian education* in immediate connection, VI. 15: Βαπτίζειτε δὲ υἱῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ θεοῦ. Αφετε γὰρ κ. τ. λ. Mark x. 14.

of those who have part in Christ, the way, the truth, and the life.

If, according to what has now been said, authority for infant baptism is to be found in the universal import of Christ's person and redeeming office, in the original idea of Christianity, in the extent of the covenant of grace, in the analogy of circumcision, and in the organic relation, spiritual and bodily, of believing parents to their offspring; it is altogether probable, that the introduction and exercise of this ordinance is as old as the independent existence of any Christian community. And under these circumstances we have every reason to believe, that it was *actually practised* in those five instances, recorded in the New Testament without the least qualification (which the Baptist theory would lead us to expect), where whole households were baptized,—the cases of Cornelius, of Lydia, of the jailer at Philippi, and of Crispus and Stephanas in Corinth; especially since these, as before remarked, are recorded only as examples, leaving us to infer the existence of many similar ones, while yet it would be contrary to all experience to suppose all the families to have been without small children.

It is true, a witness has been brought from the end of the second century to overthrow this exegetical conclusion and to prove a comparatively late introduction of the ordinance in question. We mean *Tertullian*, in his well known attack upon infant baptism.¹ But this very testimony of Tertullian, which is placed even by such distinguished scholars as Neander, Gieseler, and other pedit-baptist historians, in a distorted posture, and made to furnish unwarrantable inferences, proves most decidedly the *existence* of infant baptism, at that time, as well as of the custom, closely connected with it, of having god-parents (sponsors). Nay more, Tertullian is aware, that the practice of the whole church is against him, and he comes out, though unsuccessfully, as a reformer. Had he been able to appeal to antiquity and to oppose infant baptism as an innovation, he would certainly have taken advantage of this position. But he does not question the apostolical origin of this ordinance, nor even its propriety and legality. Of an assertion of the invalidity

¹ *De baptismo*, c. 18.

of infant baptism and the necessity for a repetition of the sacrament, there is not the slightest trace either in Tertullian or in any other ancient Christian writer. Tertullian's objections relate solely to its *expediency* and *judiciousness*, and arise partly from his notion of the magical operation of the baptismal water, and partly from a kind of Christian policy, which in the third and fourth centuries led many distinguished men, as the emperors Constantine and Theodosius, the church teachers Gregory of Nazianzen, his brother Caesarius, and Augustine, while admitting the lawfulness and validity of infant baptism, to put off their own baptism to the age of maturity and strong faith, or even to the death-bed; though Augustine at the same time explicitly declares, that he considers this a false view, and that it had been better for him, had he in tender youth been taken under the maternal care of the church. Tertullian holds an early baptism to be dangerous, because according to his Montanistic notions a mortal sin committed after baptism excludes for ever from the communion of the church, and probably incurs eternal damnation. On this ground he advises not only children, but even *adults* also, who are yet unmarried and under no vow of chastity, to put off baptism until they are secure against temptation to gross carnal indulgence.¹ This whole argument of Tertullian then rests on false premises, which were not admitted by the church. It comes before us simply as an individual private opinion against an already prevailing theory and practice, and goes strongly, therefore, to prove the contrary of what it has been often used to prove. All that can with any

¹ "Non minore de causa," says he, l. c., "*innupti quoque procrastinandi*, in quibus tentatio praeeparata est tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant aut continentiae corroborentur." So Tertullian would limit baptism to decrepit and married persons, monks and nuns! And yet he asserts, on the other hand, that a man can be saved only by being baptized with water, *De bapt. c. 1*: "Nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo salvi sumus." The vast difference of Tertullian's position in this whole controversy from that of the Baptists of our days must be clear to every one who has any historical or critical judgment. And for this reason is it so preposterous for the Baptists, who otherwise concern themselves mighty little about tradition and ecclesiastical antiquity, so zealously (and honestly no doubt) to appeal to the African church father. But they feel themselves greatly encouraged by the authority of some great German historians, especially Neander, who, although a pedo-baptist himself, was yet too latitudinarian on this, as on some other points, and suffered his latitudinarianism unconsciously to influence his historical representation of the apostolic and post-apostolic practice.

certainly be deduced from it is, that the baptism of children was not yet at that time *enjoined*, but left to the option of Christian parents. Otherwise Tertullian would hardly have contested it with so much decision. But as he had the spirit of the age against him in this matter, his protest, which, moreover, was inconsistent with some of his own principles, had no influence whatever. It fell, without an echo.

This is incontestibly shown by the next age. The African church itself, in the year 246, at a council in Carthage, decided, that the baptism of infants need not be deferred even to the eighth day, like circumcision, but might (not must) be administered on the second or third day after birth ; and Cyprian († 248), who in other matters had the greatest respect for his teacher, Tertullian, advocated this view.¹ So completely had all signs of opposition to infant baptism then disappeared, that the only question was, whether the ordinance should not, according to the analogy of circumcision, be deferred at least eight days ! About the same time the most learned representative of the Greek church, Origen of Alexandria, who was himself baptized soon after his birth (A.D. 185), and was at the death of Tertullian (about 220) some thirty-five years of age, speaks in the most unequivocal terms of infant baptism as an apostolical tradition, and the universal practice of the church.² And those, who interpret the silence of ecclesiastical writers before Tertullian respecting infant baptism unfavourably to it, do not consider, in the first place, that we have very few written memorials of any kind from this age, and are left wholly in the dark on many other points ; and in the second place, that at that time the great missionary zeal and the rapid spread of the church made the baptism of proselytes still the most frequent and, in the nature of the case, most thought of. Finally, even in Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Justin Martyr, there is no lack of hints, which indicate with more or less certainty the existence of infant baptism, but which we here pass over, as we shall have to return to them in the history of the second period.

¹ *Epist.* 59, *ad Fidum*.

² *Hom. in Levit.* 8 ; *Hom. in evang. Luc.* 14 ; *Ad Rom.* v. 9 (" The church has received it from the apostles, that she should allow baptism to little ones"), and other passages. Comp. Höfling : *Das Sacrament der Taufe*, etc. I. p. 108, *et seq.*

§ 144. *The Lord's Supper.*

The holy supper, or, as it is called in the New Testament, the "Lord's Supper"¹ or "breaking of bread,"² has reference to the preservation and growth of the Christian life. It, therefore, pre-supposes faith and regeneration. It is the solemn festival for the thankful commemoration of the atoning death of Jesus,³ for the believing appropriation and sealing of the fruits of this death, and for renewing and strengthening the vital union of believers with the ever-living, divine-human Redeemer, as well as with one another. It is thus the sacrament of the unio mystica, and of the communio sanctorum resting upon it.⁴ In it is the deepest mystery of our faith, as it were, continually embodied. In it the church, with thanksgiving and prayer, celebrates and enjoys the highest and closest union she can ever enjoy on earth with her heavenly Head, who, though sitting at the right hand of God, and thus partaking of His almighty and omnipresent power, is still, and in fact for this very reason, invisibly and yet truly present with her in the Spirit. Hence this sacrament forms the culminating point, the "holy of holies," of the Christian worship; and so it has been regarded by the church in all ages.

In the apostolic period the Lord's Supper was celebrated daily, at least where the circumstances allowed daily worship.⁵ After the manner of its institution, and the analogy of the Jewish feast of the Passover, it was connected with a simple meal of brotherly love, which afterwards (first in Jude 12) came to be called "agape," or love-feast. Originally this arrangement was connected in the church at Jerusalem with the community of

¹ Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, 1 Cor. xi. 20, or, what amounts to the same, τράπεζα κυρίου, 1 Cor. x. 21 (comp. ποτήριον κυρίου, *ibid.*) *i.e.* the meal which the Lord has appointed, which is eaten in honour of Him, and gives us the enjoyment of His spiritual and eternal blessings.

² Κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, Acts ii. 42, comp. xx. 7, 11. 1 Cor. x. 16. This term, which perhaps includes the agapae or feasts of brotherly love, is derived partly from the Jewish custom of breaking the bread and asking a blessing before the meal by the head of the family (Matth. xiv. 19. Luke xxiv. 30, 35. Acts xxvii. 35), partly from the symbolical reference of the breaking of the bread to the crucifixion of Christ.

³ Luke xxii. 19: "This do in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. xi. 24-26. Comp. the name εὐχαριστία.

⁴ Matth. xxvi. 26, *et seq.* 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 27, 29. John vi. 47-58.

⁵ Acts ii. 46, καθ' ἡμέραν, etc. Comp. vi. 1.

goods the Christians considering themselves as one household (comp. § 114). The celebration of the communion, it is commonly supposed, was the closing act of the daily social feast, and the earthly food was thus sanctified by the heavenly bread of life.¹ Yet it is possible that, even in the apostolic church, as in the second century, the communion took place in the morning, and the love-feast in the evening. Then the profanation of the latter in the Corinthian congregation, of which we are about to speak, can be better explained; whereas, on the supposition of the immediate union of the two, it would be doubly strange.

We find a similar custom, however, also among the Gentile Christians, who did not adopt the community of goods. In Corinth the believers celebrated these agapae, in which differences of rank, talent, and education were supposed to be forgotten in the equal relation of all to the Redeemer, and in the enjoyment of communion with Him; in which all were to feel themselves members of one divine family. But here a gross abuse made its appearance, arising probably from the influence of an old Grecian custom of having sacrificial feasts and public entertainments, in which each participator, according to his ability, brought with him the provision for his own use.² This custom the Corinthian Christians adopted. But, instead of obliterating all inequalities by Christian love, they obtruded even here their social distinctions. The rich members sometimes indulged immoderately at the love-feast, while the poor were left in want. Of course the apostle most emphatically rebuked this horrible profanation, by which the celebration of the holiest love was made to minister to the spirit of discord, pride, envy, and revelry.³ As these and similar abuses could hardly be prevented in the larger churches, it is not strange that, in the second century (perhaps even in the first) the love-feasts were disjoined from the communion, and by degrees entirely given up, having been, in fact, nowhere expressly commanded.

¹ The term, *δείπνον κυριακόν*, no doubt primarily denotes these two acts considered as one.

² Comp. Xenophon, *Memorab.* III. 14.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 17, *et seq.* Jude attacks a similar abuse, when he says of the false teachers, ver. 12, "These are spots in your feasts of charity (*ἀγάπαις*), when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear." So 2 Peter ii. 13, if, with Lachmann's authorities, we read *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις αὐτῶν*, which gives a better sense than the reading of the *textus rec.*, *ἀπάταις αὐτῶν*.

As a preparation for the Lord's Supper, Paul requires (1 Cor. xi. 28) self-examination on the part of the communicant, earnest inquiry as to whether he possesses faith, which receives the blessing of the sacrament, and without which the ordinance becomes a curse, and draws down upon the unworthy partaker the heavy judgment of God. On this prescription of the apostle is founded the appropriate custom of holding special exercises of divine worship preparatory to the communion.

§ 145. *Other Sacred Usages.*

Besides baptism and the Lord's Supper, mention is made in the apostolic literature of other sacred usages, which come at least very near to sacraments, and may, therefore, be designated as in a certain sense sacramental acts.

1. The *washing of feet*, as described in John xiii. 4–16, seems to answer fully the conception of a sacrament, combining all the three elements; an outward sign, the visible act of washing feet; the promise of an interest in Christ, connected with this act, ver. 8; and the express command, “I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you” (ver. 15).¹ The main design of this symbolical act, however, evidently was, in the first place, to set forth the necessity of daily repentance and purification from the pollution which still cleaves to the baptized and regenerate; and, secondly, not so much to impart to the disciples a special gift of grace, as to enforce upon them an important virtue, namely, the duty of humble, self-denying charity. Hence also the injunction of imitation relates not so much to the outward act as to the inward disposition. At least so it was understood by the ancient church, which never received the washing of feet into the number of sacraments, though it occasionally practised the ceremony as a holy usage, mostly as an appendage to the administration of baptism.² In the New Testament it never appears again, except in 1 Tim. v. 10, where it is required of widows, as a qualification for the office of

¹ Hence W. Böhmer of Breslau has recently endeavoured to vindicate the washing of feet as a proper sacrament (though without any new arguments), in the “*Studien und Kritiken*,” 1850. No. 4, p. 820, *et seq.* It is so observed by the Mennonites, and to some extent by the Moravian Brethren.

² In the church of Milan and some African churches. Comp. Böhmer, l. c. p. 839, and Bingham, *Orig. eccl.* IV. 394, *et seq.*

deaconess (comp. § 135), that they have washed the saints' feet. Here the act is plainly not a sacrament, but a proof of a self-denying kindness and hospitality to Christian strangers, which, according to the necessity and custom of the East, showed itself particularly in the washing of their feet.¹

2. The *laying on of hands*. This is in general the symbol of blessing (Gen. xlviii. 14); but, in a special sense, the medium of the communication of the Holy Ghost and His gifts, mainly for a particular office in the kingdom of God.² In the apostolic church it was performed,—

a. On all baptized persons, being, as it were, a solemn consecration to the universal priesthood. In the case of proselytes it was commonly united with the act of baptism itself, as in Acts xix. 5, 6. Yet Acts viii. 17 shows that it was occasionally deferred till some time after the baptism (as would naturally be the case in infant baptism). The evangelist Philip had baptized the Samaritans (ver. 12), and afterwards the apostles Peter and John, who were commissioned for the purpose by the church at Jerusalem, laid their hands on them, and thereby imparted to them the Holy Ghost. Commentators generally regard this as the bestowment of the extraordinary spiritual gifts—speaking with tongues, prophesying, etc.; comp. Acts x. 46; xix. 6. These, however, do by no means exclude, but rather presuppose, the communication of the ordinary spiritual gifts, which every Christian is to possess. This apostolic practice is the basis of the rite of *confirmation*, which is, in a certain sense, required by infant baptism, as the completion and solemn ratification of that act on the part of the subject. For in it (according to the beautiful custom of several evangelical churches) the baptized person, having come to years of discretion, deliberately ratifies upon himself the vow which his parents, as his responsible representatives, had made, and voluntarily, before the whole congregation, gives himself up to the service of God, and enters upon

¹ It is well known that, in the hot countries of the East, bodily impurity is more frequent, on account of the freer perspiration, than in colder climates, and very easily induces dangerous diseases—such as leprosy. Hence also the greater necessity and importance of frequent washings, even from physical considerations. Comp. the article “Reinigkeit” in Winer’s *Reallexikon*, II. p. 312, *et seq.*

² Acts viii. 17. 1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6. Heb. vi. 2. Comp. Num. xxvii. 18, 23. Deut. xxxiv. 9.

the full enjoyment of the privileges of church membership. But of course confirmation, to answer its full import, must be only the crowning act, the practical completion of the whole course of catechetical instruction and religious education at home and in the church, which infant baptism sacredly enjoins, and by which alone it can be saved from utter frustration, and be made, as divine seed in a good soil, to bear blossom and fruit.

b. At the inauguration of church and congregational officers; being here the consecration to the special priesthood, if such can be spoken of under the new dispensation. This is what afterwards came to be called *ordination*, of which we have already sufficiently spoken in § 126.

c. In the miraculous *healing* of the sick and infirm, Acts ix. 12, 17; xxviii. 8; comp. Mark xvi. 18; Matth. ix. 18, etc.

3. Finally, mention is made in two places in the New Testament, of another sacred usage, *anointing with oil*, on which the Greek and Roman churches found their sacrament of extreme unction. In Mark vi. 13 it is recorded of the disciples of Jesus, that they (no doubt at the direction of their Master, who had just given them instructions, ver. 7 *et seq.*) “anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.” And James in his epistle, v. 14, 15, gives the general advice: “Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders (presbyters) of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.” Here again all three requisites for a sacrament seem to meet. Yet in Mark bodily healing is most prominent,¹ and even James has in view perhaps mainly such sins, as had been followed by some particular disease by way of punishment. Then at any rate the context requires us to refer the first passage to the *miraculous* healing of diseases, with which gift the apostolic church was endowed. For this the anointing served as a preparation and auxiliary; as in fact oil, it is well

¹ Whereas, in the extreme unction of the Roman church, the forgiveness of remaining sins is the great thing, and bodily recovery something accessory, which may not, and rarely does, follow,—this sacrament being administered only on the apparent approach of death. The *εὐχέλαιον* of the Greek church comes nearer the original rite as enjoined by James, inasmuch as it is administered for bodily and spiritual strengthening, not only to the dying, but to all sick persons, when they request it.

known, was and is in the East frequently applied to mollify and strengthen. Hence in the Old Testament it is used as an emblem of the Holy Ghost and His regenerating, new-creating power.¹ At all events these testimonies leave not the least doubt about the high antiquity of the anointing with oil in connection with prayer. And though we leave out of view the power of miraculous healing, as no longer present in the church, and the use of oil as peculiar to the East, there still remains of James' direction thus much applicable to all ages and countries, that members of the church in sickness should send for the ministers, to impart the exhortation and consolation of the Gospel, and to commit the bodily and spiritual interests of the patient to the heavenly Physician in prayer.

¹ Comp. Isaiah lxi. 1. 1 Sam. x. 1, *et seq.* Bengel strikingly remarks on James v. 14—"Erat haec ecclesiae summa *facultas medica*, ut *juridicam* ejusdem habemus, 1 Cor. v. Beata simplicitas! intermissa vel amissa per ἀπιστίαν."

FIFTH BOOK.

DOCTRINE AND THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH.

DOCTRINE AND THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE APOSTOLIC LITERATURE AND THEOLOGY IN GENERAL.

§ 146. *Rise of the New Testament Literature.*

CHRISTIANITY entered the world not as a written letter, like the Mosaic law, but as a creative fact, as life-giving spirit. It is primarily the manifestation of the eternal Son of God in the flesh for the salvation of the world. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John i. 14). This *personal* Word, the God-man, the source of all light and life, communicated himself through the *oral* or *spoken* word, the most appropriate and perfect medium of thought and the best representation of spirit; and this was then committed to *writing* by the apostles and their disciples for the preservation of pure Christianity, and for the instruction and edification of all succeeding ages. Thus arose the seven-and-twenty books, which form the volume of the New Testament.

The spoken word of God, however, was not transformed into the written by one sudden act. Christ himself wrote nothing.¹

¹ The pretended letter of Jesus to king Abgar Bar Manu at Edessa in Mesopotamia, of which Eusebius speaks (*H. E.* I. 13), is assuredly spurious, though latterly Rinck has undertaken (in Illgen's "Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie," 1843, No. 2) to establish the contrary, particularly from Moses of Chorene († 470). It is a mere compila-

He had something far more important to do. It was His great object to perform acts, as matter for writing, yet never to be fully written or sung. The religious wants of man demand not a letter-writing, literary Saviour, but one working miracles, bearing the cross, blotting out sin, rising from the dead, ascending into heaven, sitting and reigning at the right hand of God; though assuredly such a Saviour is at the same time the inexhaustible theme of holy thoughts, discourses, writings, and deeds. Nor did the apostles begin with literary labour; having in fact received no direct instruction on this point from their Master. They preached in the fulness of the Spirit and of life, as the bearers and interpreters of the divine revelation; and with their words the new life itself streamed into those who earnestly listened. All the expressions which they use, "preaching," "gospel," "tradition," "testimony," "word," etc., show that the truth was first promulgated altogether by word of mouth.¹ The oldest book of the New Testament was probably not written before the year 50, or some twenty years after the founding of the church.² The New Testament, therefore, as a book or written volume, is not the principle, but the inspired record of Christianity; not the ground, but the product of the church of Christ, then already firmly established. But on the other hand it may be justly said, that the *substance* of the Scriptures, the saving truth, the word of God, was present at the beginning, and was, as the living utterance of the personal Word, Jesus Christ and His Spirit, the seed of the church (1 Peter i. 23; James i. 18). It is one and the same word of God, which was *heard* on the day

tion of passages from the gospels; and it is not presumable that a genuine letter of the Redeemer could have remained in obscurity till the fourth century. Still less can the pretended work of Jesus on the observance of Sunday, said to have fallen from heaven (vid. Thilo: *Acta Thanae*. prolegg. p. 85), for a moment stand the test of criticism.

¹ Κήρυγμα, εὐαγγέλιον, παραδόσις, μαρτυρία, λόγος, λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς, κηρύσσειν, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, παραδιδόναι, μαρτυρεῖσθαι, λαλεῖν; and, on the part of the hearers: παραλαμβάνειν, ἀκούειν, ἀκροᾶσθαι, δέχεσθαι, πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς. Comp. Rom. x. 14-17. 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2. Heb. ii. 1-4. Gal. iii. 2, 5, etc.

² The oldest written document of the Christian church is perhaps the epistle of the apostolic council at Jerusalem to the Gentile Christians in Syria and Cilicia, settling the dispute between them and the Jewish Christians respecting the continued validity of the Mosaic law, Acts xv. One argument for its antiquity and genuineness is also the seemingly trifling circumstance, that the name of Barnabas is placed before that of Paul, ver. 25. For to the church of Jerusalem Barnabas appeared at that time (a. 50) the more important person, while Luke from ch. xiii. places Paul first.

of Pentecost, and which is *read* to-day. For *us* the written word with the Spirit, which reigns in it, holds the place of the personal presence and oral preaching of the apostles, and is at the same time the only infallible guide to their pure and original doctrine; while the church tradition, as a source of knowledge, derives all its value from its agreement with the Scriptures, and is, therefore, subordinate to them.

The apostolic writings, which, as such, are inspired and canonical, *i.e.* furnish the infallible rule of Christian faith and practice, fall into three classes; (1) The *historical* books, embracing the four gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; (2) the *didactic* books, comprising twenty-one apostolical epistles; and (3) the *prophetic* book of the Revelation of St John.

§ 147. *Historical Books. The Gospels.*

The demand for a written record of the life and doctrine of Jesus and His apostles arose from two causes; (1) the nature and fate of all oral tradition, which, as it spreads, continually gathers legendary additions and embellishments, till it becomes at last impossible to distinguish with certainty the original substance; (2) the danger of wilful distortion, with which Judaizing and Gnostic errorists threatened the Gospel even during the lifetime of the apostles, as the warnings in the epistles of Paul and John and the many apocryphal gospels afterwards circulated abundantly prove.

Of the four canonical gospels, or rather representations of one and the same gospel, the first and the last are the work of immediate disciples of the Lord; the two others, of disciples of the apostles, and thus likewise, though indirectly, of the apostles themselves. They were not intended to be complete biographies of Jesus, but only exhibitions of certain characteristic features of His life and works, such as struck each author with peculiar force, and were most interesting to his particular circle of readers. The object was to awaken faith in Jesus as the promised Messiah, the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world, and to lead the readers by this faith to true, eternal, divine life (comp. John xx. 30).

As to the date of these books; the first three gospels appear, both from internal marks and from the testimony of the oldest

tradition, to have been written in the seventh decade of the first century; therefore before the destruction of Jerusalem, which they represent in the prophetic discourses of the Lord as future, but nigh at hand. Single portions of the life of Jesus, however, and collections of His discourses, prepared in some instances by unskilled hands, were in private use before that time in various Christian circles. This we must infer from Luke's preface, i. 1-4, which, accurately translated, reads thus: "Whereas many have undertaken to compose a narrative of the things accomplished among us, as those, who were from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the word (that is the apostles), have delivered them to us; it seemed good to me also, having closely followed everything from the first, to write it out in order for thee, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest obtain a sure and reliable knowledge of the things in which thou hast been instructed." The fourth gospel was written between the years 70 and 100, at any rate last of all; for it evidently presupposes the others, and exhibits the highest position and maturest development of the apostolical theology (comp. § 105).

The relation of the gospels to one another is one of the most important, but at the same time most difficult points in the criticism of the evangelical history. We must here of course confine ourselves to the most general outlines. We cannot enter into the confused and confusing hypotheses of modern hypercritics;—the less, since by their wild extravagances and their own mutual contradictions they have already refuted themselves.¹ Each gospel has its peculiar character, which corresponds to that of its author, of its circle of readers, and of its design. The differences, however, are not contradictions, but simply the various aspects of one and the same picture. The character of the God-man is so sublime and comprehensive, that one hand

¹ The detailed discussion of this matter belongs in the historico-critical introduction to the New Testament. The modern German literature on this subject, especially since the appearance of the notorious "Leben Jesu" of Strauss, is so extensive, that one cannot see the forest for the trees, and it is high time to come out of the labyrinth which men have built around themselves, and get once more into the open air. The lavish expenditure of ingenuity and power of combination which has gradually piled up a whole mountain of hypotheses respecting the origin and mutual relations of the gospels, we should have to mourn over deeply as labour lost, had we not the consoling thought, that by calling forth able replies it has involuntarily served to confirm the evangelical history and promoted the cause of truth.

could not possibly give a full delineation of it. All the gospels together are required, to furnish a complete picture of His life and works. This is indicated by the ancient comparison of the evangelists with the four symbols of the cherubim, the representatives of creation; to Matthew being commonly (according to the view of Jerome), assigned the man, to Mark the lion, to Luke the ox, to John the eagle.¹ The apparent contradictions in the whole conception and in the narratives of single events, when carefully examined by the unprejudiced, truth-loving reader, resolve themselves, at least in every point at all essential, into a higher harmony, and go to show the impartiality, honesty, and credibility of the authors. If all fitted together with mechanical precision, it would awaken suspicion of concert and artful calculation.²

The first gospel was written by the apostle Matthew, in Palestine and for Jewish Christians, originally in Aramaic,³ and afterwards, most probably by himself, in Greek. The third gospel is the production of Luke, the disciple and attendant of Paul. It was composed plainly under the influence of Paul's spirit and peculiar theological views, probably during that apostle's confinement in Caesarea and Rome, and for Gentile-Christian readers; primarily, for one Theophilus. The Gospel of

¹ In like manner Dr J. P. Lange, in the third volume of his spirited *Life of Jesus*, 1847 (in which, however, poetical fancy has almost as large a share as scientific investigation), endeavours to follow out the fruitful thought, that the four gospels represent the fourfold relation of Christ to the life of the world, and the fourfold susceptibility of the world for the life of Christ. He exchanges, however, the symbols assigned to Matthew and Luke, giving to the former the ox and to the latter the man.

² We may mention also in this connection, as a proof of the watchful care of Providence over the preservation of the Scriptures, that, of the fifty thousand various readings or more hitherto discovered in the New Testament, by far the majority have not the slightest influence on the sense or doctrinal import; and where they touch an important dogma, as in the evidently spurious passage on the Trinity, 1 John v. 7, which is to be found in no manuscript before the tenth century, this dogma is unequivocally taught in many other decidedly genuine passages. So in the case just referred to, the doctrine of the Trinity, not only by the baptismal formula and the apostolical benediction, but by all that the New Testament teaches of the divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost, is more fully and firmly established than it could be by any single expression.

³ The lost Hebrew original was in our view a complete gospel, embracing the same historical constituents, and substantially identical with our Greek Matthew; not a mere collection of sayings, as Schleiermaeher ingeniously but erroneously gathered from the *λόγια* in the well-known deposition of Papias in Eusebius III. 39.

Mark, according to a credible account preserved in Eusebius (VI. 14), was written in Rome, and designed, as may be seen from its frequent Latinisms¹ and explanations of Palestinian peculiarities, in the first instance for Roman readers. It holds a position of mediation between the two others, like that of Peter between James and Paul, between the strictly Jewish-Christian and the Gentile-Christian views. In fact, tradition traces it back, at least indirectly, to Peter himself, whose confidential companion Mark was at first in Jerusalem and at last in Rome (1 Peter v. 13), and whose "interpreter" he is stated to have been by the apostolic father, Papias. While it was formerly a current hypothesis, that Mark was a somewhat superficial epitomist of Matthew and Luke, important critics of various schools latterly incline to the opposite view, that the second gospel is the oldest and forms the basis of the first and third.² This furnishes the best explanation of the fact, that Mark's gospel contains what is common to both the others, while it exhibits neither Matthew's peculiar order of subjects, nor Luke's chronological arrangement,³ and also leaves chasms, particularly in the history of the childhood of Christ and of His appearances after the resurrection; the conclusion, chap. xvi. 9–21, being the work of a later hand. It relates the sacred history in its simplest, freshest form, reminding one of the short but graphic accounts of Peter in the Acts (x. 36–42). "Thus would the first evangelist stand connected with the first apostle, and Peter, more than any other

¹ Such as δηνάριον denarius vi. 37; xiv. 5; κεντυρίων centurio, xv. 39, 44, 45; κῆνος census, xii. 14; κοδράντης quadrans, xii. 42; γράββατος grabbatus, ii. 4, 9, 11, 12; λεγεών legio, v. 9, 15; πραιτώριον praetorium, xv. 16; σπεκουλάτωρ speculator, vi. 27; φραγελλῶν flagello, xv. 15.

² We must not omit to refer here to the interesting work of the Scotchman, James Smith, on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St Paul* (London, 1848, p. 279), who, on the ground of original investigations, comes to the following conclusion: "Before either St Luke or St Matthew wrote their gospels, the memoir which was afterwards translated by St Mark, existed in Hebrew, and has been made use of by both these evangelists. St Luke seems to have embodied the whole of it in his gospel, hence the agreement between him and St Mark, when they differ in the order of time from St Matthew." This Hebrew original of Mark, Smith supposes to have been written by St Peter upon the spot, immediately after the events took place which he has recorded (p. xviii.) He also understands the remark of Papias on Μάρκος ἑρμηνεύτης πέτρου, of this very translation.

³ To this want of strict chronological order refers the οὐ μέντοι τάξις, which Papias uses in his much talked of and variously interpreted testimony respecting the Gospel of Mark (in Eusebius, *H. E.* III. 39).

disciple of the Lord, would be by his indirect share in the Gospel of Mark the founder of the church in reference also to her permanent records of the history of Christ." But in this case we must certainly suppose an error in the statement of Clement of Alexandria, who says expressly, that the gospels containing the genealogies were written before that of Mark.¹

§ 148. *Historical Books (continued). John and the Synoptical Evangelists.*

The first three evangelists, however, or synoptical writers, as they are called in distinction from John, with all their individual peculiarities, are still strikingly similar. They are alike in the matter of their gospels, all giving substantially the same representation of Christ throughout; recording the preparatory work of John, the baptism of Jesus, His miracles in Galilee, His last journey to Jerusalem, His sufferings, death, and resurrection. They have forty-two portions of the history in common. Then they are alike as to form, often to verbal coincidence, particularly in their reports of the discourses of Jesus and of the most important events. This agreement may be accounted for in great part by the fact, that the oral tradition of the discourses and works of Jesus, from which the evangelists drew, had acquired by continual repetition, among the apostles and their disciples a stereotyped form, which the synoptical writers scrupulously, but not pedantically, transferred to their books.

The fourth gospel is stamped with a peculiarity, which most clearly distinguishes it from all the rest. It stands alone in its kind. The differences between the synoptical evangelists and John are, indeed, among the most remarkable phenomena of the New Testament, were remarked in a general way even by the church fathers, and have been shown up with the keenest discrimination by modern criticism. But they have also certainly been exaggerated and wilfully misrepresented by the assailants of the Bible, and are not yet satisfactorily explained in all

¹ In Eus. *II. E. VI. 14.* Thiersch (*Die Kirche in apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 103) seeks to remove this difficulty by the hypothesis that Mark's Gospel existed for a long time merely as a private writing, and was first published, with the addition of the present conclusion, after the death of Peter, and received among the sacred books of the church; while the works of Matthew and Luke, though later composed, were earlier published.

points by its defenders. They fall mainly under the following heads :—

1. The *design*. In this the fourth gospel is comprehensive and universal. It has in view, not a particular section of the church, but the whole, Jewish and Gentile Christians together. And by setting forth what is most profound and spiritual, the esoteric, so to speak, in the appearance and discourses of Jesus, the eternal Logos incarnate, it aims to raise the church to the highest grade of believing knowledge, and thus at the same time to secure her against the seductions of the false Gnosis, which in the last decades of the apostolic period was threateningly lifting its head. This combination of the historical with a clearly stamped didactic character, places the fourth gospel in a certain sense in a class with the New Testament epistles.

2. The *theatre* of events. The synoptical evangelists describe chiefly the labours of Jesus in Galilee and among the common people ; John presents His activity in Judea and among the educated—the Scribes and Pharisees. Yet this difference is merely relative. For the former distinctly take for granted Christ's labours in Judea, as in Matth. xxiii. 37 ; xxvii. 57 ; and John records several miracles in Galilee, and that plainly only by way of example, as the turning of water into wine (John ii. 1, *et seq.*), the healing of the son of a nobleman in Capernaum (iv. 47, *et seq.*), the feeding of the multitude, and the return over the sea of Galilee (vi. 1, *et seq.*), and he expressly declares, that Jesus did many other signs, which are not written in this book (xx. 30 ; comp. xxi. 25). One reason, why John brings us so often into the theocratical capital, undoubtedly is, that there the conflict, which he wishes to describe, between the eternal Light and the darkness (comp. i. 5, *et seq.*) comes to view in its greatest depth and strength, and is at last decided in the catastrophe of the crucifixion and the triumph of the resurrection.

3. The synoptical evangelists give us more of Christ's *acts* and *miracles* ; John more of His *discourses*. It is true, the latter relates six miracles, and among them the two greatest, not recorded by the others,—the changing of water into wine, and the raising of Lazarus. But he commonly makes the works only the starting-points for the discourses of Jesus, which are with him of paramount importance. The wonderful deeds are the practical,

sensible demonstrations, the wonderful words are the theoretical and more inward proof, of the divine glory of Christ. The two are mutual counterparts. Only one, who could do such works as the first three evangelists narrate, could deliver such discourses as John records; and conversely, for such a Christ as John's, the Only Begotten of the Father, it must be a small thing to make the powers of nature subservient to the moral end of His mission. The great thing with the fourth evangelist, however, is always the *person* of the Saviour, which reveals itself most immediately in His creative words of spirit and life, and which alone imparts even to His outward miracles their convincing power. This is the living, central miracle, and all the miracles properly so called are but natural emanations from it; as the sun, once existing, *must* radiate light and heat; as the tree puts forth blossoms and fruit as the necessary product of its inward life. Hence John calls the miracles of Christ without the least qualification, His "works."¹ Healing the sick and raising the dead are only steps by which to lead men gradually from a lower level to the adoration of Him, who is himself the resurrection and the life, and in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake."²

4. In the reports of the *discourses* of Jesus themselves there is again a difference both as to matter and form. The synoptical evangelists record for the most part those speeches which relate to the regulation of the conduct, and to the idea of the kingdom of God; and these they clothe in a simple, popular, easily-remembered form, mostly the parabolic and sententious. John, on the contrary, chooses those in which the Redeemer sets forth the mystery of His person, His relation to the Father and to believers, and the mission of the Holy Ghost; and that generally in a manner so mystical and profound, that not only the unsusceptible Jews, but even His own disciples, at that stage of their knowledge, almost uniformly put a fleshly misconstruction on His words, or,

¹ John v. 36; vii. 21; x. 25, 32, 38; xiv. 11, 12; xv. 24.

² John xiv. 11. Many excellent remarks on John's conception of the miracles of Jesus may be found in R. Ch. Trench: *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, London (p. 14, Amer. ed.) Comp. the criticism of this work in the "Mercersburg Review," 1850, p. 573, *et seq.*

at least, had but a faint glimpse of their spiritual meaning.¹ This difference is closely connected with that already observed in the design, the theatre of events, and the circle of readers. Yet we find occasionally in the synoptical evangelists also dialectic and argumentative conversations with learned opponents (comp. Matth. xii. 22, *et seq.*; xxii. 15-46), and expressions addressed to the disciples, which in their simple sublimity and deep tenderness strikingly resemble the discourses in John (*e.g.* Matth. xi. 25-27); while on the other hand John also gives a couple of specimens of his Master's parabolical mode of instruction, viz., the parables of the good shepherd (chap. x.) and the vine (chap. xv.), besides detached, sententious passages, such as chap. iv. 7-26, 33-38; vi. 32, *et seq.*; xiii. 16, 17; xii. 24-26; comp. Matth. x. 39.

Modern assailants of this gospel² have drawn from the many misapprehensions of the discourses of Jesus in John an argument against either the credibility of the history or the Lord's wisdom in teaching. But it must be remembered, that these mistakes were in great part occasioned by want of susceptibility and spiritual discernment in the hearers, and are to this day repeatedly occurring under the simplest preaching of the cross; while on the other hand even a child or an untutored peasant, if of truly earnest heart, may understand at least so much as is necessary for his salvation, and does in fact understand it far better than many a learned and ingenious critic. Of every word of Jesus, also, in the synoptical gospels, the old comparison of the stream, which bears at once the lamb and the elephant on its current, is emphatically true. Then again, our Lord purposely introduced obscure, paradoxical, and seemingly offensive expressions in His discourses, to fix the attention of His hearers and excite them to farther reflection. It is the manner of every great popular teacher to let himself down to his disciples only so far as is necessary for raising them up to his higher level, and, instead of repeating in every-day style what is familiar to all, to rouse their slumbering faculties by presenting something original in an original form, and to awaken each to a consciousness of his peculiar gift.

¹ Examples of such misconceptions are John ii. 20-22; iii. 4, 9, 10; iv. 11, 15, 33; vi. 42, 52; vii. 35, 36; viii. 33, 57; xi. 12, 13; xiv. 5, 8, 9; xvi. 17, 18.

² Especially the Tübingen school.

Finally, we must ever keep in mind that the Saviour of the world spoke words of eternal life, not only for His contemporaries, but for all future ages and generations; and that their meaning, therefore, must be inexhaustible as himself, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Another objection, which has been raised against the credibility of John's record of the discourses of Jesus is, that they are too long to have been retained. But in the first place, not only antiquity, which had not books to depend on, as we have, and carried its learning in its head, but modern times also, afford examples of astonishing power of memory.¹ Why should not the susceptible John, who lay on his Master's bosom, have been able to retain His discourses, especially as these were not merely some of many things equally important to be remembered, but the apostle's most precious treasure, his priceless jewel, the centre of his thought and life? Besides this, however, it was expressly promised (John xiv. 26), that the Holy Ghost should remind the apostles of all they had heard from Christ, make it intelligible to them, and fully assimilate it to their spiritual being.

A third objection urged by the negative criticism against the discourses of Jesus in the fourth gospel is their subjectivity, that is, their adaptation to the writer's style and system of thought. Beyond question they strikingly resemble the first epistle of John in matter and language. Undoubtedly the apostle has not merely mechanically memorized his Master's words of life and as mechanically repeated them; he has assimilated them to his inmost being, and reproduced them in a living way, so that they are as much his as they were Christ's. But this process of reproduction was preceded by another, viz., the entire sinking of the beloved disciple's personality into that of his divine Master, so that thenceforth he could not think, speak, or write otherwise than in the Saviour's way. He truly formed himself on his

¹ Think, for example, of Themistocles, who, when the art of remembering was offered to be taught him, wished rather to learn the art of forgetting; of Mithridates, who knew by heart all the names of his many thousand soldiers, and could address each in his mother tongue; of modern scholars, as Lipsius, Leibnitz, Joh. von Müller, who knew almost whole authors word for word; of the cardinal Mezzofanti, who, if I am rightly informed, was acquainted with near forty languages and dialects; finally of those rude Indians, who were able to repeat verbatim the sermons of missionaries which they only half, if at all, understood.

Lord's bosom; that was his school. He first went into Christ, and then Christ came forth again from his spirit and consciousness. It is well known, that very independent and original authors may so completely live themselves into another genius, that their productions become strikingly similar in thought and style.¹ This, considering all we know from the other evangelists, from his own writings, and from tradition, of his tender, susceptible, self-surrendering nature, and his intimate friendship with Jesus, must have been particularly the case with John. Rather must we, therefore, reverse the matter, and say, that the epistles of John are a sequel, an echo, of the discourses of Jesus in the fourth gospel, and not the latter an arbitrary imitation of the former. From the affinity in question an inference unfavourable to the accuracy of John's reports of our Lord's discourses could be drawn, only when these reports should contradict those of the other gospels. But such contradiction no critic has yet been able to *prove*. There is none. John's record presents the same Christ, the same inexhaustible theme, only in a different, peculiar aspect, in that aspect, which John by his peculiar character was specially fitted to apprehend. This leads us to the last point of difference.

5. The whole peculiarity of the fourth gospel centres in its conception of the *person of Jesus Christ*, of which the discourses are the immediate expression. This difference may be briefly stated thus:—The synoptical evangelists set before us mainly the glorified humanity, John the incarnate divinity, of the Lord. There the Saviour appears as the sinless, faultless "Son of Man," in whom the idea of our race, the full image of God, is first perfectly realized; here, as the true "Son of God," who was one with the Father before the creation of the world, and who everywhere reveals through the veil of the flesh His eternal glory, full of grace and truth. Matthew portrays Him as the last and greatest Prophet, the Messiah and King of the Jews, the Fulfiller of the law and the prophets; Mark, in brief, graphic

¹ Compare, for example, the *Odyssey* with the *Iliad*, which can hardly have come from the same author; Horace with his Grecian models; the epistle to the Hebrews and that of Clement to the Corinthians with Paul's epistles; Joh. von Müller with Tacitus; Schleiermacher with Plato. Or go to the poets, as Shakspeare and Göthe, who can enter into and speak in the most diverse characters.

sketches, as the mighty Wonder-worker, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the embodiment of omnipotence; Luke, as the ever ready and kind Physician of body and soul, as the Shepherd of lost sheep, the Saviour of poor sinners, the merciful Philanthropist, the demolisher of the partition-wall between Jews and Gentiles; John, as the centre of the universe. The first three proceed from below upwards, beginning with the birth of the Lord from the womb of a virgin, and following Him through His mighty works, as also through the toil and privation of His earthly life, through the bitter death of the cross and the repose in the tomb, to His victory over death and the grave, and His triumphant ascension on high, where "all power in heaven and in earth" is given Him as the reward of His labour. John proceeds from above downwards, from heaven to earth, from the eternal pre-existence of the Logos to His appearance in human flesh. He traces the pedigree of his hero, not merely to Abraham, the patriarch of the *Jews*, as does the Hebrew Matthew; nor to Adam, the progenitor and representative of *all* men, as does the Pauline Luke; but to the absolute beginning in the depths of eternity; makes Him proceed from the bosom of the Father; accompanies Him, the Source of all light and life in the world, through the creation and preservation of all things, and through the successive steps of the general revelation to all men, and the special revelation to the Jews, down to the incarnation; depicts His victorious conflict with the darkness of the ungodly world; makes His unity with God in essence and will gleam forth in all His discourses and works; and shows Him to us after the complete victory, glorified with "the glory which He had with the Father before the world was." If in the synoptical gospels we behold with admiration and astonishment, faith and love, the divine Son of Man, in the Gospel of John we are rapt in adoration of the human Son of God, and exclaim with Thomas—"My Lord and my God!"

Hence the Alexandrian fathers styled the fourth gospel "pneumatic" or spiritual, and the three others "somatic" or bodily. Thus Clement of Alexandria,¹ following the statements of fathers before him—"Last of all John, perceiving that in those

¹ In Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. 14.

gospels the bodily was set forth, encouraged by his friends, moved by the Holy Ghost, composed a spiritual gospel." To this incomparable picture of Christ's person is chiefly due the irresistible attraction of John for the most profound and genial theologians of all ages, from Clement and Origen to Schleiermacher and Neander. But his gospel must not be extolled at the expense of the others.¹ The synoptical gospels are also spiritual and ideal. Not seldom do they lift the veil from the wonderful mystery of the Godhead in Jesus of Nazareth. In fact, that mystery glimmers through all their records of the Saviour's words and deeds, and furnishes the only key to their full meaning. Then, on the other hand, John is radically opposed to all false spiritualism and Docetism, and declares with the strongest emphasis, that Christ, though one with the Father, is yet at the same time truly man, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, whom the disciples saw with their own eyes, heard with their ears, and handled with their hands.²

In short, John and the synoptical evangelists complete and confirm each other in setting forth Him, who combines the divine and human natures in the indissoluble unity of His person, and is thus constituted Mediator between God and man, between eternity and time, between heaven and earth, the immovable foundation of the Christian church and the eternal source of her life and peace.

§ 149. *The Acts of the Apostles.*

Last among the historical books, though belonging not to the "Evangelion," but according to the old division to the "Apostolos," is the Acts of the Apostles by Luke. Of this we have already had occasion more than once to speak, since it is our principal authority for the external history of this period. It announces itself at the outset as an immediate continuation of the third gospel, which is hence called "the former treatise" (Acts i. 1). It is addressed to the same Theophilus, probably a

¹ As it is, for example, in the school of Schleiermacher. Against this, the criticism of Strauss and Baur was a natural reaction, which went to the opposite extreme, running out at last into absolute impossibilities and absurdities, and thereby condemning itself.

² John i. 14; xix. 34, 35; xxi. 20, 27. 1 John i. 1.

distinguished Roman, and is evidently, as may be seen from the very affinity of language and style,¹ the work of the same author. Luke, having been for many years an attendant and faithful friend of Paul (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 11), was best qualified to be his biographer; and his residence in Jerusalem and Cæsarea, during his teacher's two years' imprisonment, gave him an excellent opportunity to collect documents respecting the earlier history of the church in Palestine. Probably he began his work at Cæsarea, and with the aid of these older documents, of his own observation, and of the additional communications and corrections of Paul, finished it during the two quiet years of the apostle's confinement in Rome, A.D. 61–63.

As the gospels aim at no complete biography of Jesus, so the book of Acts gives, not a full history of the life and labours of the apostles, as the old title (not however given it by Luke) would indicate; but a simple and invaluable history of the planting of the Christian church, first among the Jews by the labours chiefly of Peter, and then among the Gentiles in Syria, Asia Minor; Greece, and Rome, principally by the labours of Paul. It begins with the ascension of our Lord (or the taking possession of His throne and the commencement of His mediatorial reign) and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost for the founding of the church, and closes with the joyful preaching of the great apostle of the Gentiles in the world's metropolis; which virtually decided the victory of the Gospel. Of the labours of the other apostles Luke gives scarcely any information, and even respecting the end of the two leading apostles he leaves us in the dark; either because it did not belong to his design to record this, or, more probably, because he completed so much of his book before the decision of their fate, and was afterwards by circumstances or considerations unknown to us prevented from continuing it.

§ 150. *The Didactic Books.*

The doctrinal portion of the New Testament consists of thir-

¹ That is, in the parts composed by Luke himself. For his reports of Peter's discourses bear a marked resemblance to the doctrinal system and the style of Peter; and the discourses of Paul, an equally striking affinity with the epistles of that apostle,—no trifling proof of the historical fidelity and the credibility of the book of Acts.

teen epistles of Paul, two of Peter, three of John, one epistle of James, one of Jude, and the anonymous epistle to the Hebrews, written according to one view by Paul himself, according to another conjecture, by one of his pupils and fellow-labourers, Luke, Barnabas, or Apollos. Most of Paul's epistles, the two to the Thessalonians, the one to the Galatians, the first to Timothy, the one to Titus, the two to the Corinthians, the one to the Romans, and the epistle of James, were composed before the gospels and the Acts, between the years 50 and 60, as has been shown in detail in the first book. The epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, to Philemon, to the Philippians, the second to Timothy, as also the epistle to the Hebrews and the two epistles of Peter, and probably that of Jude, belong in the seventh decade, most of them between the years 62 and 64. John's epistles with the fourth gospel bear all the internal marks of having been written after the destruction of Jerusalem and towards the end of the first century.

This second class of primitive Christian documents was called forth in general by the necessity of correspondence, which naturally arose with the spread of the church, and even preceded the demand for written gospels. As it was impossible for the apostles to be present in all their churches at once, and yet necessary that they should oversee them and lead them forward in the Christian faith and life, they had no other way, but to compensate for their personal presence by sending delegates and written communications. To this general necessity were added, in each case, special occasions for writing, particularly dangers of theoretical and practical error and division, which everywhere more or less threatened these young churches. While the gospels and the so-called catholic epistles (not including the second and third of John) were written with reference, more or less distinctly, to the church at large, or at least the greater part of it, and for future as well as present use; all Paul's epistles, on the contrary, are in the first instance specially intended for single congregations or private persons, as Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. So far, they are all occasional writings.

But God in His wonderful wisdom and grace so ordered, that these individual and apparently incidental occasions and wants represented all the principal wants and occasions, which should

arise in the church; so that those epistles answer for all ages, and cover the whole province of Christian faith and practice, "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." The early defects and errors of the natural man, whether on Jewish or Gentile ground, are in substance perpetually returning, and the old exhortations and warnings are, therefore, always applicable and quite as forcible, fresh, and effectual as in the first century. What is extraordinary and divine about this apostolic literature is, not that it arose in a magical way, without occasion, but precisely the contrary; that it arose by an altogether natural process, organically growing out of special existing necessities, and yet conceals under this truly opportune and concrete individual form an inexhaustible store of matter legitimately applicable in all places and circumstances. The most subjective is here at the same time the most objective; the most strictly individual is absolutely universal. We must accordingly say also of the *written* word of God, that it "was made flesh" like the eternal personal Logos, and subjected to all the conditions and laws of natural, human development, but that its servant-form was radiant with eternal glory, "full of grace and truth." The Bible is throughout truly divine, yet throughout truly human, and thus alone adapted to men.

As to their design; the didactic books are all addressed to baptized Christians, not to unconverted heathens or Jews. They presuppose the preaching of the Gospel and the commencement of the Christian life, and hence serve not so much to awaken as to nourish and strengthen that life. The historical books, therefore, as preparatory, are properly placed first in order, though composed in some cases later. Only the gospel of John, as before observed, has, besides its historical, also a didactic character, and aims to advance Christian knowledge to the highest stage of intuition.

But now as all Christian doctrine rests upon the facts of the Gospel, so on the other hand it is not confined to the head, but reproduces itself in new life and new acts. Hence all the epistles, especially those of Paul, besides their doctrinal portion, have also an ethical or hortatory part, and this not limited merely to the last chapters, but everywhere interwoven with or immediately

attached to the exposition of doctrine. Thus doctrine is at once the fruit and the seed of life.

§ 151. *The Prophetic Book of the Revelation.* (Comp. § 101 and 107.)

The Revelation of St John forms the third species of apostolic literature, and the most appropriate and sublime conclusion, the divine seal of the whole.

The mode of its production was different from that of the other New Testament books. The gospels and epistles proceeded from a *state* of divine illumination united with entire self-control and clear consciousness. The Apocalypse is the result of a special *act* of inspiration, an immediate revelation of Jesus Christ respecting His advent, dictated, as it were, to the entranced seer by the Holy Ghost. The sacred penman should not, indeed, even here, be deprived of all agency of his own and made a *perfectly* passive tool. But the state of mind, in which he received and communicated the revelation, was not that of ordinary intellectual reflection (*νοῦς*). It was that of extraordinary, ecstatic, immediate intuition (*πνεῦμα*), in which the finite reaches over into the infinite. All the prophecy of the Scriptures rests on direct, divine inspiration, though it has a subjective basis in man's faculty of presaging (often, especially in momentous transition periods, greatly elevated), and his impulse to lift the veil of the future.

In matter and form the Revelation is closely allied to the prophetic literature of the Old Testament, particularly the book of Daniel, combining its boldest and most powerful tones in an overwhelming harmony. But with the poetical, symbolical style, it unites also the epistolary in the letters to the seven churches. It intersperses its visions with lyric songs of praise, which afford the soul a delightful resting-place amidst the rushing crowd of events. And it surpasses all the Hebrew prophecies in the sublimity of its views, the majesty of its imagery, the variety of its symbols, the dramatic vividness, unity, and finish of its composition, the progress of its action, and finally in its specifically Christian element, the reference of all the parts to the crucified and now glorified God-man.

Prophecy, alike in the Old Testament and in the New, is

founded on the idea of the divine government of the world, unavoidably presupposing that history is not a product of chance, but an unfolding of the thoughts and plans of eternal wisdom, justice, and love, and must, therefore, always issue in the glory of God, the salvation of His people, and the confusion of His enemies. The grand theme of Old Testament prophecy is the first coming, that of New Testament prophecy the second coming of the Lord and His kingdom, with all the preparatory and attendant events. We expect not a Messiah, as did the Jews, but the reappearing of the Lord to judge the quick and the dead, and to glorify His bride. Hence hope is a cardinal virtue of the church militant. Hence, too, the New Testament, though it devotes not so much space to prophecy as the Old, could not be without it.

We find several prophetic passages scattered through the gospels and epistles. Among these may be mentioned especially the discourses of our Lord himself respecting the destruction of Jerusalem and His final advent, Matth. xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xvii. 22, *et seq.*; xviii. 8; xxi. 6-36; and the frequent references of the apostles to Christ's second coming, and its presages, such as the great apostasy, the spread of dangerous errors, and also the propagation of the Gospel in all the world, 1 Thess. iv. 16, *et seq.* 2 Thess. ii. 1-12. Rom. xi. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 51, *et seq.* 1 Tim. iv. 1-3. 2 Tim. iii. 1-5; iv. 3, 4. 1 John ii. 18, 22; iv. 3. 2 John 7. 2 Peter ii. 1, *et seq.*; iii. 3, *et seq.* Jude 18, 19.

All these elements John's Apocalypse combines in one dramatic picture, giving us, in grand, highly poetical visions and symbols, a representation of the sufferings and triumphs of the kingdom of Christ, down to its consummation in the new heavens and the new earth. The Lord comes, the Lord is at hand, Christ struggles, Christ conquers and leads His church through much persecution and tribulation to certain glory,—this is the grand thought of the mysterious book.

The practical design of the Revelation, as also of prophecy in general, is, not to gratify idle curiosity, to encourage subtle and presumptuous speculations, but to remind us of our entire dependence on God, and of our sacred duties—to exhort and comfort the faithful. By unveiling the future and the hidden present, the seer would incite the seven churches of Asia Minor,

which represent the whole church in its various forms and tendencies, to watchfulness, patience, fidelity and perseverance in their struggles and hardships, and, at the same time, would comfort and animate them by the divine assurance of the infallible victory of Christ over all His enemies, and of the eternal triumph of His bride.

The Apocalypse, accordingly, is a book of warning, encouragement, and hope, and is best understood practically in times of trial and persecution.¹ This purpose of edification it has in fact ever served, notwithstanding the very various, and sometimes altogether contradictory, historical expositions, which it has met even at the hands of truly pious theologians, who in other more important points perfectly agree. We may fully concede the unsatisfactory character of all attempts yet made to explain it, from Irenæus down to Lücke and Hengstenberg—and for our own part we must confess, that none of the many commentaries are altogether satisfactory, however much light they may throw on the details,—we may be honestly persuaded, that the proper key to the full scientific and historical understanding of this remarkable book has not yet been found, without thereby being obliged in the least to doubt its divine origin and high practical value.² It belongs, in fact, to the nature of every divine prophecy to unveil itself but gradually, and to be fully intelligible only in the light of its fulfilment. So the prophetic writings of the Old Testament remained half understood, or misunderstood, till the appearance of Christ; as in fact the whole Old Testament becomes clear only in the New.³ Nay, even the apostles

¹ This is remarked by the venerable Bengel, whose merits as an expositor of the Revelation are very great, even though his historical application of the beast to the papacy should be wholly wrong, as well as his chronological system, which, at least in a main point, the year 1836, has been actually refuted. He says: "This book is a book of the cross. It was given to John in his affliction, and under trial it is best understood and appreciated. In seasons of quiet security it was almost forgotten, but under the persecutions by the heathen emperors, and those subsequently endured by the Waldenses, the Bohemian brethren, etc., it has been turned to good account. Many a one too may soon be glad of the book, who now refuses to receive it."

² As sometimes, it is to be regretted, even great and pious men have done; Luther, for example, in his honest, but very hasty and irreverent judgment of the Apocalypse (*Vorrede* of A.D. 1522, and also of 1534), which he would consider neither apostolic nor prophetic, because no one knew what was in it; though he employed it, when it suited him, against the papacy.

³ According to the striking expression of Augustine: "Novum Testamentum in

were long entangled in all sorts of carnal prejudices. It was only by degrees, and under the special guidance of their Master, that they rose to a deeper spiritual knowledge of the Messianic promises. Nevertheless, to souls anxiously waiting for the salvation of Israel, these prophecies, though in many points misapprehended, were an inexhaustible source of spiritual strength, comfort, and refreshment.¹ Precisely the same may be said of the last strains of the beloved disciple, in which, at the close of the apostolic age and the century of miracles, soaring yet once more on eagle's wings to behold the eternal triumph of his divine Master, and the glory of the bride "adorned for her husband" on the sanctified earth, he bequeathed to the church militant these precious visions under the seal of the Holy Ghost, as a cordial for all her hours of temptation and affliction. As such, the Apocalypse has already been, in fact, of the most valuable service to the people of God,—during the bloody persecutions by the Roman power in the first three centuries; at the descent of the barbarian hordes amid the storms of the migration; under the conquests of Mohammedanism; and in every heavy calamity and persecution which has since befallen the church. Hence also its significance did not cease with the dissolution of the old Roman heathenism, any more than did the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies stop with the events of Jewish history, to which they primarily refer. The age of the Neronian and Domitianic persecutions is not the goal, but only the historical starting-point, of the Apocalypse, and the basis of its interpretation. As the kingdom of Christ advances, so rises also the empire of Antichrist and false prophecy in ever new and more dangerous forms; and every new conflict of the two, and every

Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet, or "*V. T. est occultatio Novi, N. T. manifestatio Veteris.*" The same may be said of the relation of prophecy to fulfilment.

¹ This is remarked also by Herder in his commentary on the Apocalypse, which abounds in glowing eloquence, although we must consider it as on the whole entirely erroneous, since it refers everything to the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem. "How many prophets have we in the Old Testament," says he finely, p. 194, *et seq.* (*Werke zur Theol.* Part 12), "in many of whose passages we do not know the primary historical references, while yet these passages, containing divine truth, doctrine and consolation, are manna for all hearts and all ages! Should it not be so with the book, which is an abstract of almost all prophets and apostles? This book (though sealed to many a plain Christian as to its scientific interpretation) is a book of instruction and comfort for all churches in which Christ walks."

new victory, follow the same general laws, and form a new and higher fulfilment of the prophecy.

We cannot but agree, therefore, with the genial Herder, when he styles the Revelation of St John “a book of instruction and comfort, manna for all hearts and all ages.” If curious minds have occasionally been led astray by it, it is their own fault. They would have been led astray without it, by the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, or by any other book, whose meaning does not lie immediately upon the surface. It is in every respect well that the spirit of inquiry and attentive observation of the signs of the times, in the light of the Scriptures, should be constantly re-awakened. While it accumulates much hay and stubble, which the fire consumes, it also continually brings out new treasures of gold and silver from the mines of the prophetic word. The Apocalypse furnishes each generation just what its peculiar dangers, conflicts, and necessities require, and for each succeeding period of church history it has some new significance and some higher fulfilment. Hypercritics, bringing to the study of the Old and New Testaments, not the thankful disposition of children and heirs, but the heartless analytics of a special pleader, may say what they please against it; their own wisdom will be forgotten, but the book they despise will be hereafter, as heretofore, to thousands of the best and noblest souls a star of hope in the darkness of midnight, a stimulus to holy desire, an earnest of future blessings, and will afford them from time to time a foretaste of the new heavens and the new earth, till the Lord shall come to take home His longing bride.

§ 152. *Organism of the Apostolic Literature.*

If from this point we look back upon the New Testament canon, we observe in it a beautiful organism, the three parts charmingly fitting together in one whole. The historical books form the foundation, the didactic the edifice itself, and the Apocalypse the dome. Or, to use another figure, the first are the root, the second the branches, the third the ripe fruit. The three classes bear the same relation as conversion, sanctification, and glorification, or as the cardinal Christian virtues, faith, love, and hope. The substance, the all-absorbing theme, the beginning, middle, and end of the whole is Jesus Christ. In the gospels

He walks in bodily presence before us. In the epistles He assumes an invisible, but none the less real existence, in the Holy Ghost. In the first chapters of Acts we see Him glorified, hovering, as it were, on the confines of the two worlds; then a cloud removes Him from the sight of the apostles, and puts an end to His visible, finite presence, but only to make room for His mystical omnipresence in the life of the church, which is for this reason styled "His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." In the Apocalypse He re-appears visibly, but no longer in the form of a servant and in the likeness of sinful flesh. He comes forth in the full splendour of His spiritual and bodily glory, with the crown of stars, and His face shining as the sun. All His enemies are vanquished. All tears wiped away; all pains banished; all mysteries solved. The ideal of beauty, truth, and holiness is perfectly realized; body is all glorified in spirit; heaven and earth are one; the city of God is finished and prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." "Surely I come quickly. Even so come, Lord Jesus!"

We have now to exhibit in the next chapter the organism of the apostolic *doctrine*, as it comes to view in the epistles. But a few remarks, first, respecting the language in which these writings have come down to us.

§ 153. *Language and Style of the New Testament.*

In the language of the apostolic writings we must distinguish three elements, the Greek, the Hebrew, and the specifically Christian.¹ The union of these makes the books of the New Testament an altogether peculiar genus of literature, and furnishes evidence no less of their genuineness than of the universality of their destination.²

¹ The Latin element is very insignificant, confined almost entirely to single technical terms, occurring mostly in the Gospel of Mark, such as δηνάριον, πραιτώριον, κουστοδία, κεντυρίων, κήνος, κορδάντης (quadrans), ξέστης (sextarius), λεγεών, etc.

² To this the "Northern Magus," Hamann, has drawn attention in his genial way. "The books of the New Testament," says he in his *Kleeblatt hellenistischer Briefe* (Part II. p. 204, *et seq.* of his complete Works), "are written ἑβραϊστί; ἑλληνιστί, ῥωμαϊστί, like the title of the cross, John xix. 20. If it be true, that they were put forth in the Jewish land, under dominion of the Romans, by people who were no literati of their age, the character of their style is the most authentic evidence respecting the writers,

The *Greek* of the New Testament is not the pure Attic idiom, as we find it in Plato, Xenophon, Thucydides, and the great tragedians ; but the latter colloquial dialect, *κοινή διάλεκτος*, as it is called. This arose, indeed, on the basis of the Attic literary language, but took up ingredients from other dialects, chiefly the Macedonian, in the time of Alexander the Great and his successors. It meets us in the works of Aristotle, Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch, Aelian, and most of the Greek authors in the days of the emperors, except such as Josephus, Lucian, Libanius, who affected the pure Attic. It was spoken especially in Alexandria, the metropolis of Graeco-Oriental culture, and is hence sometimes called the *Alexandrian* dialect.

This idiom was employed by almost all the Jews of the dispersion, who thus came to be called Hellenists¹ (Acts vi. 1 ; ix. 22), to distinguish them from the Hellenes or proper Greeks on the one hand, and on the other from the Hebrews or Palestinian Jews, who spoke the Aramaic. The Greek, moreover, was at that time quite prevalent in Palestine. There were regular Hellenistic synagogues there, and it is very probable that the Saviour himself sometimes, as in conversation with proselytes and heathens,² and before Pilate, used the Greek.³ And on the other

the place, and the time of these books." From this apologetic point of view, and with special reference to this remark, Dr H. W. J. Thiersch particularly has recently investigated the language and style of the New Testament books in the first chapter of his *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts*, etc., 1845, p. 43, *et seq.*

¹ From *ἑλληνίζειν*, to act the Greek or imitate the Greeks, primarily in language, then in manners and customs, in mode of thinking and acting (as Josephus, *De bello Jud.* II. 20, 3, uses the term *ῥωμαϊζειν* of those Jews, who held with the Romans in the Jewish war. Comp. *πλατωνίζειν* and other such expressions). *Ἑλληνισταί* are therefore primarily Jews who speak Greek ; and these also were mostly less stiff and bigoted in religion than the *Ἑβραῖοι*. The representatives of the more liberal-minded Gentile-Christian tendency in the apostolic church, were almost all Hellenists ; Barnabas of Cyprus, Luke, perhaps of Antioch, Apollos, probably of Alexandria, Timothy a half-Jew, of Lystra, and Paul of Tarsus, who, however, was of a strictly Jewish family, the son of a Pharisee (Acts xxviii. 6), and received his education in Jerusalem.

² As with the *γυνή Ἑλληνίς* of Phenicia, Mark vii. 26, and with the *Ἑλληνες*, John xii. 20.

³ Respecting the condition of the vernacular in Palestine we refer especially to the learned investigations of Hug, in his *Einleitung in's N. T.* II. § 10. Also to Thiersch, l. c. p. 48, *et seq.*, who gives it as his opinion "that Christ was master of the Greek language, that He could use it, but in His intercourse with His disciples and with the people He preferred the vernacular (Aramaic), so nearly akin to the sacred Hebrew."

hand there were also in the Greek provinces Jewish families, which rigidly adhered to the sacred language and customs of their fathers. In this sense Paul calls himself "a Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. iii. 5). The Jews, however, spoke this Greek, not pure, but largely adulterated with their native Hebrew, or rather the closely allied Aramaic, that is, the vulgar Syro-Chaldaic or Babylonian dialect, which since the Babylonish exile had supplanted the pure or ancient Hebrew in ordinary intercourse. This Judaizing Greek has accordingly, since Scaliger, been very aptly styled the *Hellenistic* idiom, with reference to the appellation of the Jews, who spoke Greek. It meets us, not only in the New Testament, but also in the Septuagint translation of the Old, in the apocryphal books of the Jews, in the works of the theological philosopher Philo, and to some extent in the historian Josephus, who, however, certainly not without affectation, aimed at the old Grecian Attic elegance.

This *Hebrew* element in the apostolic writings is to be imputed to the influence of the Old Testament and of the current Aramaic. It does not, however, enter to the same extent in all, but varies in prominence according to the peculiar character of the author, or more especially of the contents. The tincture is strongest in the historical and prophetic literature; for this was modelled on the Old Testament. We observe it in the first two gospels, and in those parts of the gospel of Luke, where the author gives sacred traditions just as they stood, above all in the songs of Mary and Zacharias (i. 46–55 and 68–79), which bear throughout an old Hebrew psalmodic stamp, and are probably literally translated; again in the first part of the Acts, where the history has its theatre in Palestine, and is drawn almost wholly from Jewish-Christian sources; finally, and most of all, in the Apocalypse, to the ideas of which the language of the classical literature was utterly inadequate. The didactic books of the New Testament, for which the Old afforded no model, come nearer the pure Greek idiom. The best style on puristic principles is that of Luke, particularly in the second part of the Acts, where he ceases to follow the accounts of others, and describes the labours and fortunes of Paul mostly as an eye-witness; that of James, whose glowing, forcible use of the language is the more surprising, because he was so decidedly Hebrew in sentiment, and probably always lived

in Palestine ; and that of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, who evinces a familiar acquaintance with the rarer forms and turns of Greek expression, and frequently (as in the first four verses, and in the eleventh chapter) rises to real rhetorical elegance. Paul too, however, considering his Rabbinical training, possessed great skill in the use of the Greek. His full and well-turned periods are in perfect accordance with its genius ; and at times, especially in his epistles to the Corinthians, he introduces delicacies of style well timed for readers in a city of Grecian culture. On the other hand, James, in the beginning of the fifth chapter of his epistle, assumes the tone and style of prophetic rebuke ; showing that the preponderance of one or the other linguistic element varied in the same author with the character of his subject. The style of John in his gospel and epistles is, in words and phrases, mostly pure Greek, but in construction exceedingly simple and artless, without many connectives, and without periods,—very Hebrew like.

The crude and pitiable view of the older, or so-called vulgar Rationalism, that the Hebraisms of the New Testament are so many grammatical blunders and violations of the Greek, a more thorough philology and exegesis (especially since Winer) has banished from all truly learned circles. With equal reason might the Grecisms of the Latin poets, the Germanisms of the Romanic languages, and the many Latin and French elements of the English be condemned as corruptions and errors. The Hebraisms form, on the contrary, a peculiar and necessary modification, extension, and enrichment of the Greek, wherever, in its previous form, by reason of the close connection between thought and word, that language was found inadequate ; as, especially, in the prophetic literature. The Hebrew tinge imparts to the New Testament literature a peculiar beauty, to appreciate which, however, requires more than a mere knowledge of grammar. It gives the apostolic writings the attractive, childlike character, the elevated simplicity, and the venerable antiqueness of the sacred language of the patriarchs, and has its share in setting forth the inseparable unity of the two testaments, the old and new revelations of God.

But to the Greek basis and the Hebraisms of form and structure must be added the third element, the *Christian*, which is

the soul of the whole New Testament, distinguishes it specifically from all Greek and Græco-Jewish writings, and gives it a place of its own in the history of literature. The spirit of the Christian revelation shows itself, in the province of language, not so much in coining new words and phrases as in making a new use of old ones. The apostles made words already at hand the vehicles of infinitely profounder ideas than they had ever conveyed before, or continued to express afterwards in heathen authors.¹ Even the Seventy were compelled to put into many Greek expressions an Old Testament idea, which it requires a sympathy with the whole spirit of the divine revelation to understand. To a far greater extent is this the case in the New Testament, which contains a universe of new ideas, throwing even the Old Testament far into the shade. The very terms of most frequent occurrence and of the greatest importance for Christian faith and practice, as light, life, truth, resurrection, atonement, redemption, saviour, apostle, church (assembly), election, calling, justification, sanctification, faith, love, hope, peace, liberty, humility, blessedness,—darkness, flesh, unbelief, sin, death, condemnation, etc., have a far more comprehensive and profound sense than in any profane writings, or, in most cases, even in the Old Testament; though this sense is certainly agreeable to the natural import and the etymology of the word. In this view it may be said, that, as Christianity is the perfection of humanity, so the Christian language is the full development of the natural. Hence the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew is not enough for understanding and theologically interpreting the Bible. To this must be added above all an experimental sympathy with the spirit, which fills the words and makes them vehicles of its profound ideas.

In this use of the Hellenistic idiom for conveying the Christian revelation we must admire particularly the powerful genius of the apostle Paul, struggling with the language to create the most suitable expression for his idea. His style, in general, is a fitting channel for the bold majestic stream of his thought. True,

¹ Comp. Dr Robinson, in the preface to the new edition of his *New Testament Lexicon*, p. 5, *et seq.*: “The language of the N. T. is the later Greek language, as spoken by foreigners of the Hebrew stock, and applied by them *to subjects on which it had never been employed by native Greek writers*,” etc.

it is often harsh, abrupt, and irregular, like nature. It has none of the careful polish and artistic exactness to be found where a writer depends on his mode of expression for much of his effect. Paul says himself, 2 Cor. xi. 6, that in speech, but not in knowledge, he was rude; that is, according to the standard of the Greek philosophers and rhetoricians, whose taste, however, had undoubtedly already become very corrupt. He is always too full of his subject, too much occupied with the matter, to waste time on the form. His mighty spirit breaks away from the trammels of ordinary rules, and often rises to the height of sublimity. It is well known that the heathen rhetorician, Longinus, placed him among the greatest orators; and the accomplished critic, Erasmus, remarks on Rom. viii. 31-39: "Quid usquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius!" In fact, this passage, as well as that seraphic hymn on love, 1 Cor. xiii., is, even on merely esthetic and rhetorical principles, beyond all question one of the most beautiful and sublime things in the history of literature. Paul's writing is always manly and noble, fresh and vigorous, clear and exact, terse and concise,¹ fascinating and suggestive, sometimes plying the lash of irony² and sarcasm,³ but also melting into the tenderest strains,⁴ or ingeniously and winningly playing on words.⁵ He delights in colossal antitheses⁶ and the massive, dialectic progressions of the Greek periods. Even his many *anacolutha* are usually only the excess of a virtue, the result of his ardent temperament and overflowing fulness of soul; emotion crowding upon emotion, thought upon thought. The prominent characteristics of his style are fervour and force, and it has not unjustly been styled a "perpetual battle."⁷ But his polemic zeal is always under the control of sober reflection, and at times, as in the incomparable description of love, 1 Cor.

¹ In conciseness and precision there is a striking resemblance between Paul and the renowned historian Thucydides. Comp. Bauer: *Philologia Thucydideo-Paullina*, 1773, and Baur: *Paulus, der Apost. Jesu Christi*, p. 663.

² E. g. 1 Cor. iv. 8. 2 Cor. xi. 18, *et seq.*

³ Phil. iii. 2; *περιτομή* and *κατατομή*.

⁴ Acts xxvi. 29. 2 Cor. ii. 5, 7, 10.

⁵ Phil. v. 10, *et seq.*, where he touchingly alludes to the meaning of the name Onesimus, *i. e.*, useful; Rom. xiii. 8. "Owe no man anything, but to love one another."

⁶ Comp. Rom. ii. 21-23. 2 Cor. iv. 7-12; vi. 9, 10; xii. 22-30.

⁷ Tholuck: *Vermischte Schriften*, Part II. p. 320. Calvin also, on 2 Cor. xi. 6, observes of the writings of Paul: "Fulmina sunt, non verba."

xiii., gives place to the most delightful calmness and benignity.¹

On the other hand, the style of John, "the son of thunder," while it breathes the gentle air of peace, as it were, from the celestial regions of the church triumphant, also rolls along at times, especially in the Apocalypse, according as the subject requires, with the awful power of thunder.

To sum up all; the language and style of the apostolic writers has its peculiar beauty, appearing in different forms, according to the character of the author and the subject; a beauty not lying, indeed, on the surface, veiled rather in the garb of humility and poverty, in the form of a servant, like the Lord himself; but for this very reason affording the freer scope to the power of the Holy Ghost and divine grace, and all the more wonderful in its effects. The weak and the despised has God chosen to confound the great and the brilliant, that the glory may be the Lord's and not man's. Were the New Testament written with the Attic elegance of a Plato, or a Xenophon, or a Sophocles, or a Demosthenes, it would be perhaps a book for philosophers, for the educated few, but not, as it this day and ever will be, a book for the people, the bread of life for all ages, conditions, and classes of men.

¹ "In the letters of St Paul," says an able writer in the "Edinburgh Review" for January 1853, "while every matter relating to the faith is determined once for all with demonstrations of the spirit and power, and every circumstance requiring counsel at the time, so handled as to furnish precepts for all time, the whole heart of this wonderful man is poured out and laid open. Sometimes he pleads, and reminds, and conjures in the most earnest strain of fatherly love; sometimes playfully rallies his converts on their vanities and infirmities; sometimes with deep and bitter irony, concedes that he may refute, and praises where he means to blame. The course of the mountain torrent is not more majestic and varied. We have the deep, still pool, the often returning eddies, the intervals of calm and steady advance, the plunging and foaming rapids, and the thunder of the headlong cataract. By turns fervid and calm, argumentative and impassionate, he wields familiarly and irresistibly the varied weapons of which Providence had taught him the use. With the Jew he reasons by Scripture citation, with the Gentile by natural analogies; with both, by the testimony of conscience to the justice and holiness of God. Were not the epistles of Paul among the most eminent of inspired writings, they would long ago have been ranked as the most wonderful of uninspired."

CHAPTER II.

DIFFERENT TYPES OF 'THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE.'

§ 154. *Origin and Unity of the Apostles' Doctrine.*

CHRISTIANITY is, primarily, not doctrine, but life, a supernatural fact and testimony extending its leaven-like, transforming influence equally to all the faculties of the human soul, thought, feeling, and will. It came into the world as the climax of the revelation or self-communication of God, as a divine saving fact, a new moral creation, deposited originally in JESUS CHRIST, the incarnate Word, the God-man and Saviour of the world, to be propagated from Him to the entire human race,—not, indeed, necessarily to the numerical, but to the organic whole of humanity. So also in the individual believer it exists first in the form of life, or the communion of the whole man with God through Christ. The measure of this divine *life* (not the amount of theoretical knowledge, or of practical morality, or of feeling,¹ separately considered) is the measure of the man's piety; and perfect communion with God is perfect religion. Doctrine is only the clear consciousness of the life made an object of reflection, and presupposes, therefore, the presence of the life as the general and primordial.

The doctrine of the apostles in the New Testament everywhere appears in this close, organic connection with the original fountain of life. It is not abstract theory, not a product of speculation, but something experienced in actual life, and for this very reason in turn productive of life, thoroughly practical, full

¹ As Schleiermacher holds, whose view on religion, identifying it with feeling (the feeling of absolute dependence upon God), is just as one-sided and erroneous as the other two which he so keenly and successfully refutes.

of the unction of the Holy Ghost and of moral power. It comes before us, too, not as a logical, scientific system, but in an humble, unpretending, generally intelligible form. The Bible is intended to be, not merely a work for the learned, but a popular book, in the highest and noblest sense, a book for all mankind. Nevertheless it has a systematic structure, though not outwardly marked. The apostles start from a living principle, from which, as biblical theology has minutely to demonstrate, the several points of doctrine necessarily follow. Yet in this respect again they differ. Paul, who had no small philosophical talent, and had received a learned education, proceeds far more methodically than the others. The epistle to the Romans, particularly, is almost a scientific treatise, and it is not difficult to show the strictest logical connection among all its parts.

The common source of the apostles' doctrine is partly outward, partly inward; partly the objective, theanthropic history of the crucified and risen Saviour, of which they were eye-witnesses; partly the immediate illumination of the Holy Ghost, which was promised them by the departing Redeemer,¹ and communicated on the day of Pentecost, the birth-day of the church (Acts i. 4), and which alone could enable them fully to understand the life and teaching of Jesus. This illumination or inspiration is to be regarded as *central*; in other words, one, which acted with creative power on the very essence and centre of their being; which transferred not only their knowledge, but their whole personality, with all their intellectual and moral faculties, into a new and higher sphere of existence, into the heart of the Christian truth; and which thence pervaded and determined all their particular views and relations, their words, their writings, and their actions.

The common subject of the doctrine of the apostles is the person of Jesus Christ, the promised Messiah, the true God-man; and the divine life and salvation, which was manifested in Him, was secured to mankind by his self-revelation, death, and resurrection; shaped itself through the Holy Ghost into a church of the redeemed, a means and a fellowship of salvation; is communicated to the individual sinner through faith and the means of

¹ John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7. Luke xxiv. 49.

grace, the word and sacraments; works his conversion, justification, sanctification, and eternal blessedness; and will fully develop itself in the glories of Christ's second coming.

These are the essential articles of faith, on the living appropriation of which salvation depends, and which the Apostle's Creed (justly called apostolical as to its *contents*) so beautifully arranges under the three divisions of God the Father and the work of creation, God the Son and the work of redemption, and God the Holy Ghost and the work of sanctification, ending with life everlasting. And in all these points James, Peter, Paul, and John, perfectly agree. We cannot acknowledge the least inconsistency among the various books of the New Testament, either in respect to faith or practice. They are all animated by the same spirit, aim at the same end, and form a truly wonderful harmony. All the apostles and evangelists teach, that Jesus of Nazareth is the highest revelation of the only true God; that He perfectly fulfilled the law and the prophets; by His death and resurrection reconciled humanity with God and redeemed it from the curse of sin and death; by the outpouring of His Spirit has established an indestructible church, and furnished it with all the means for the regeneration and sanctification of the world; that out of Him there is no salvation; that a man must repent and believe in Him, and express this faith in his entire life, in order to enjoy the benefits of Christ's mission; and that this life of faith develops itself, in individuals and in the church, under the continual direction of the Holy Ghost, through much suffering and tribulation; triumphs at last over all its foes; and becomes gloriously complete at the second advent of the Lord. In short, there is in the apostolic church "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. iv. 5, *et seq.*)

"But unto every one of us," the apostle immediately adds, "is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ;" that is, to each for a particular purpose, and within certain limits, according to the wisdom of the Lord and the wants of the church. For unity should never be confounded with monotonous uniformity. All living unity involves diversity, multiplicity, and fulness. So with the unity of the apostolic doctrine. And as, on the one hand, we discard the rationalistic theory, which, on

the principles of the natural understanding, implicates the synoptical evangelists with John, James with Paul, in irreconcilable contradiction, thus undermining all reverence for the holy word of God; so, on the other hand, must we guard against the opposite extreme of a stiff, lifeless orthodoxy, which looks upon the literature of the New Testament as a thing of abstract, mechanical and colourless uniformity of structure, and makes no due account of the human authors, and their several peculiarities of character.

§ 155. *Diversity of the Apostles' Doctrine.*

The eternal substance of this truth, comprised in the absolute union of Deity and humanity in the person of the Redeemer, each of the leading apostles held in a peculiar historical form, and in that particular form, too, which was specially adapted to his individual character, his training, and his field of labour. The Gospel may, in this respect, be compared to a jewel, which at every turn emits a new radiance, yet remains the same; or to the one beam of light, which breaks into diverse colours according to the nature of the substance it falls on, yet always emanates from the same sun. These peculiar modifications or shapings of the Christian principle in the New Testament Scriptures we call the different systems or *types* of the apostolic doctrine. They originate in the various modes of conceiving the relation of Christianity to the two grand religions of the old world, Judaism and Heathenism.

As all the apostles were Jews, and as their knowledge was rooted in the Old Testament, they, very naturally, first brought the new principle of life, which was given them in Christ, into connection with their former religious views, and then applied it to their respective spheres of labour in different ways, according as they had to deal entirely, or at least mainly, with Jews or with Gentiles. To them all Christianity appeared as the completion of the Old Testament, and Jesus as the true Messiah, the fulfiller of the law and the prophets. Christ himself had declared, "I am not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil" (Matth. v. 17). This very expression, however, implied a twofold relation between Judaism and Christianity, a *unity* and a *difference*. The two religions are both covenants,

but differ as old and new. Both are revelations of the same God for the same end, the glory of the Lord and the salvation of mankind ; but the one is preparation, the other completion ; that is law and prophecy, this Gospel and fulfilment ; the former is revealed in the latter, the latter latent in the former. There God appears chiefly as the just and holy Lord, and the pious as His obedient servants ; here God is the loving and merciful Father, and believers His children and heirs. Judaism is “ the letter, which killeth,” and a shadow of good things to come ; Christianity is the “ spirit, which giveth life,” and the substance itself. The one is the religion of authority, the other the religion of freedom. That was intended for a single nation and a certain time ; this is designed for all nations and all times—the absolute religion for the world. The permanent truth in the Old Testament is taken up by the New, confirmed, brought into connection with the person of Christ, and transformed by His Spirit, but by this very process divested of its restricted national and temporary form. Christianity is at once an organic growth out of Judaism, and a new creation, which could never have sprung from the old alone, without a creative act of God.

Now, it is essential to apostolical and all sound Christianity to combine these two views, the *unity* and the *difference* of the Jewish and Christian revelations ; both to place the New Testament in close connection with the Old, and yet to maintain its new and peculiar character. The denial of either gives rise to a fundamental heresy ; and of such we observe the germs even in the apostolic period. The denial of the distinction between Judaism and Christianity is Ebionism ; the denial of the unity of the two is Gnosticism. From both these extremes the New Testament Scriptures are equally removed, and, in fact, against both they contain express warnings.

But this double relation admits of being viewed from two positions, which, while they keep, in principle, both the distinction and the unity of the two revelations, give the chief prominence, one to the unity, the other to the distinction ; two positions, therefore, not contradictory, but mutually supplemental. The first view, exhibiting Christianity predominantly in its harmony with the religion of the Old Testament, was most congenial to the older Jewish apostles of Palestine, and best suited for the

Jewish mission. The other, which saw in the Gospel a new creation, the spirit of absolute freedom, was best adapted to the Hellenistic apostle, who was called in a sudden, extraordinary manner by the transforming grace of God, and destined to labour among the heathen. For the Jews, even after their transition to Christianity, felt the need of adhering as closely as possible to the sacred traditions of their fathers; while the Gentiles found in their previous religion little or no connection with the Christian, though the latter, of course, met the deepest wants of their nature; and towards the precepts of the Mosaic law, which had not been given to them, they had no such reverence nor sense of obligation as the Jews.

§ 156. *Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and their higher Unity.*

Thus, from the twofold relation of Christianity to Judaism, and from the difference in the callings of the apostles, arose two different, but mutually supplemental theological tendencies, which we may call the *Jewish-Christian* and the *Gentile-Christian*. The first was represented in the beginning by all the older apostles, the twelve, who had gradually come out of the bosom of their ancestral religion, and laboured chiefly among the circumcision, particularly by Peter and James.¹ The second appeared in Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, so abruptly and irregularly called at a later time, and in his coadjutors, particularly Barnabas (comp. Gal. ii. 8, 9). This antagonism between Jewish and Gentile Christianity reaches through the whole apostolic age, until, at the end of the first century, in the writings of John, it is lost, so to speak, in a third view, which may be styled the absolutely Christian, or the *ideal*.

We may accordingly distinguish, in the development of the apostolic theology, three stages, the *Petrine*, the *Pauline*, and the

¹ Paul, Gal. ii., names John, indeed, along with James and Cephas, among the pillars of the apostles of the circumcision. But this refers to an earlier time; since the epistle to the Galatians was written in the year 56. We must distinguish in the life and labours of John two periods, that before and that after his transfer to Paul's sphere of labour in Asia Minor; and his writings, from which we learn his theological views, all date during his residence at Ephesus, and after the destruction of Jerusalem. Moreover, he seems to have held from the first a conciliatory position between the two parties, and to have observed a mysterious silence. Comp. § 100 above.

Johannean. They run parallel with the three sections of the history of missions as presented in the first book—the Jewish mission, centering in Jerusalem, the Gentile mission, with its seat in Antioch, and the activity of John, which took up, combined, and completed these two, and had its centre in Ephesus.

Christianity naturally addressed itself first to the Jews, from the midst of whom it proceeded, and who, according to God's gracious promise, had the first claim to it. The church in Jerusalem, with the apostles at its head, was essentially distinguished, indeed, from the Jews around, by its faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, the Son of God, who had risen from the dead, and by its possessing in this faith true divine life; but this faith itself wrought in them under the hallowed forms of the old covenant. While, therefore, they imputed their justification, not to the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, but to Christ (comp. Acts iv. 12), they still continued to observe those ceremonies, and keep as close as possible to the temple worship of the theocracy (comp. § 137).

The distinction of two tendencies, a more constrained and a more free, a strictly conservative and a progressive, made its first appearance in the opposition between the Jews of Palestine and those of other lands, or Hebrews and Hellenists (Acts vi. 1, *et seq.*) It was brought out by the deacon Stephen, a Hellenist of bold spirit, skilful in the Scriptures, and dialectically trained. By him the Christian system, which had hitherto been at issue chiefly with Sadducism on the doctrine of the resurrection, was put in conflict with Pharisaism or stiff self-righteous legalism. Stephen rose to the view of the approaching emancipation of the church from the religious and national exclusiveness of the Jewish economy, which was hastening to its doom. Thus he was the forerunner of the apostle Paul, who was converted, as it would seem, immediately after the death of this first martyr, in order to save and gloriously carry out the idea for which he died (Acts vi. 8. Comp. § 58). This first bloody persecution was the occasion of spreading the Gospel out of Judea by the fugitive Christians, and at the same time of enlarging their views. Soon came the conversion and reception into the church of the semi-pagan Samaritans, through the labours of the evangelist Philip, probably also a Hellenist, and the apostles Peter and

John (chap viii.) Still more important was the founding of the first mixed church at Antioch, which was firmly established, and made the starting point and centre of the Gentile mission, chiefly by Barnabas of Cyprus and Saul of Tarsus. Nor is it by any means accidental, that this mother church of Gentile Christianity originated the proper name of the followers of Jesus (xi. 26), by which they have since been distinguished as well from Jews as from heathen. About the same time a change, which marks an epoch, was produced in the leaders of Jewish Christianity themselves by the vision of Peter, and the reception of the uncircumcised Cornelius into the Christian communion (Acts x.) From that time not only Peter, but, in consequence of his public recital of the incontrovertible facts, the whole church at Jerusalem also (comp. Acts xi. 18), were convinced that the Gentiles need not, as had formerly been thought, become Jews, before they could have part in the Christian salvation. Thus they acknowledged, that the same Holy Ghost, who wrought in them, wrought also in the uncircumcised; and with this they gave up the idea of the absolute nature and design of Judaism, though for *their own part*, not in order to justification, but from traditional reverence and for the sake of their influence with their countrymen, they continued as before to keep the Mosaic law, till God himself actually destroyed the theocratic system, and formally released them from it. A few disturbers only, “false brethren unawares brought in,” as Paul styles them (Gal. ii. 4), wilfully set themselves against these signs of the times, this advance in knowledge, and maintained that circumcision and the observance of the whole ceremonial law was *necessary to salvation*; thus denying that we are saved by faith in Christ alone. These were the *heretical* Jewish Christians, the precursors of the Ebionites. These bigoted Judaizers raised a mighty hue and cry, particularly against the apostle Paul, who meanwhile had already laboured with great success among the heathen, and had admitted them into the church without imposing on them the yoke of the law.

In this state of things the apostles thought it best to settle the controversy, and prevent the threatened rupture by a public convention. This was the council at Jerusalem, A.D. 50 (Acts xv. Gal. ii.) Here the difference of the two tendencies, the Jewish Christian and Gentile-Christian, was not concealed or wiped out.

It was fully acknowledged; but at the same time the deeper unity, which bound both parties to the same faith in the all-availing merits of Christ, was openly brought out in opposition to the Pharisaical Christians, and a compromise was agreed upon, which, while calculated to secure the peace of the church in its present posture, encroached on the rights of neither party. The Jews it left to their national form of religion, undisturbed in their observance of the law; and upon the heathen converts it placed no burdensome yoke, but only such requisitions as a regard for pure morality and the principles of Christian charity would lead them readily to fulfil. The apostles of the circumcision and the apostles of the uncircumcision recognised each other's peculiar mission and gifts, and in the consciousness of unity in difference and difference in unity, exchanged the hand of brotherly fellowship (Gal. ii. 9. Comp. § 68 and 69). And so they laboured thenceforward in different spheres and with different gifts, but harmoniously towards the same great end. For the collision between Paul and Peter in Antioch sprang not from a conflict of principles, but from a momentary inconsistency (Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*), and was merely a passing cloud. The exception only proves the rule, which was, in this matter, as is abundantly clear from all their writings, the fraternal unanimity of the two apostles.

The following years, from 50 to 64, witnessed the imposing labours of Paul and the development of the Gentile-Christian principle in doctrine and in practice. All Paul's numerous churches in Asia Minor and Greece, as well as that at Rome, were composed, indeed, of Jews and Gentiles together, so that the deep-seated national and religious antagonism could not fail to show itself also in the province of Christian faith. The Jewish Christians were more strict, scrupulous, legal, conservative, than the others. But it is in dealing with these that Paul shows his genuine spiritual freedom. He does not take forcible measures to annihilate or suppress the antagonism in question, but freely indulges it, provided only all hold the common foundation, Christ the only author of salvation; and in subordinate points, such as eating particular kinds of food, observing feasts, etc., he exhorts to mutual fraternal charity, patience and accommodation (1 Cor. viii. and ix.; Rom. xiv. 1, *et seq.*); as in fact he himself in love became to the Jews a Jew, to the Greeks a Greek, that he

might, if possible, gain all (1 Cor. ix. 19–23). It was only against the “false brethren” of the circumcision, who were creating disturbance and schism in almost all his churches, particularly in Galatia, and sought salvation in lifeless ceremonies and mechanical actions instead of living faith in the Redeemer, as also, on the other hand, against the opposite sort of errorists, who perverted the freedom of Christ to the shameless indulgence of the flesh;—it was only against these, that he came out on every occasion in inflexible firmness with refutation, warning, and rebuke.

Thus stood matters in the seventh decade at the decease of most of the apostles. The church was almost everywhere divided between two national tendencies, the two parties being mutual counterparts, agreeing in essentials, loving one another as brethren, but not yet grown together in full unity, and still exposed also each to a corresponding morbid ultraism. The Jewish Christians, especially in Palestine, were in danger of sinking back into carnal Judaism, as the Galatian false teachers and the later Ebionites actually did; and in view of this the epistle to the Hebrews lifted its voice of fearfully earnest warning. The Gentile Christians, on the contrary, particularly in Paul’s churches in Asia Minor, were threatened with the more subtle seduction of the false Gnosis, with its spiritual licentiousness and its dissipation of all historical Christianity into the thin air of speculation, which even Paul, Peter, and Jude, but especially John in his day, found it necessary to resist as antichrist. Then broke the long predicted judgment of God on stiff-necked Judaism. Jerusalem, and with it the whole temple cultus, was overthrown, and thus the last cord severed, which had hitherto bound the Christian church to the old economy. The Jewish-Christian churches now had no alternative, but to apostatize and petrify, or to advance from their narrow legalism to a position of greater freedom, and coalesce with the Gentile Christians. Besides, the national difference between Jewish and Gentile Christianity must necessarily disappear so fast as the church should become an independent power, till she should bring forth a new generation, in whose veins neither Jewish, nor Gentile, but specifically Christian blood should circulate, as it were, from the very womb.

At this third and highest point of view, from which the two

previous types of doctrine and forms of practice fall into a compact, organic unity, stands St John, who survived the leaders of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and after the destruction of Jerusalem combined in his writings the results of the whole preceding development of the apostolic church, both theoretical and practical.¹

This, in brief and general survey, is the course of the apostolical theology, as it lies before us in the canonical records of primitive Christianity. Its development goes hand in hand with the spread of the church, and to some extent also with the shaping of religious life and of the systems of government and worship.

We have then three leading forms of apostolic doctrine, under which all the books of the New Testament may without any violence be distributed :—

1. The JEWISH-CHRISTIAN theology, or the system of Christian doctrine in its unity with the Old Testament. This is represented by the leaders, or, as Paul styles them (Gal. ii.), “pillars” of Jewish Christianity, James and Peter; with this difference, that James presents especially the unity of Christianity with the law, Peter its unity with prophecy, forming at the same time the transition from the position of James to that of the Gentile apostle.² Under this head fall the gospels of Matthew and Mark, and the epistle of Jude.

2. The GENTILE-CHRISTIAN theology, or Christianity in its distinction from Judaism, and viewed as a new creation. This is the type of doctrine presented by the Gentile apostle, Paul, and embraces also the gospel and the book of Acts by his attendant Luke, and the anonymous epistle to the Hebrews.

3. The JOHANNEAN theology, which adjusts the differences of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and merges the systems of Peter and of Paul in its sublime and profound conception of the mysterious theanthropic person of the Saviour. Here belong the Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation of the beloved disciple.

¹ Comp. above, § 100.

² Were it preferred to make James and Peter the representatives of two distinct tendencies, we should have four types of apostolic doctrine, which would beautifully correspond to the four gospels, that of James to Matthew, of Peter to Mark, of Paul to Luke, of John to his own gospel. We think the triple division best, however, because James and Peter after all present only the two necessary aspects of Jewish Christianity, the legal and the Messianic.

These three forms of doctrine cover the whole field of saving truth as it is in Jesus, and at the same time exhibit the leading tendencies of the human mind in its relation to the Gospel. They, therefore, satisfy all doctrinal wants, as the gospels meet all the demand in the sphere of history. It is true, the whole difference in the views of the apostles centres, as we have seen, in the grand practico-religious question of their day, the relation of Christianity to Judaism, or the import of the Mosaic law. But from this historical centre it extends its influence more or less to all the several departments of doctrine or life, and involves ideas which underlie the religious conditions and wants of all ages of the church.

To translate the relations of these doctrinal types from the language of history into that of philosophy, and reduce them from concrete, temporary form to abstract principle, we may say, that Jewish Christianity is the Christian religion viewed mainly from the standpoint of law, authority, and objectivity; Gentile Christianity is the same religion conceived and expressed predominantly as gospel, freedom, and subjectivity. The former represents the conservative element, the latter the progressive. But as law and gospel, authority and freedom by no means absolutely contradict each other, as in their lowest root and ultimate aim they are one; so Jewish and Gentile Christianity, the Petrine and the Pauline systems, are far from being inconsistent; and the theology of John is but the full development and expression of the unity which secretly bound the two together from the beginning. Every real and proper advance in history involves the co-operation of conservative and progressive forces; thus necessarily occasioning, however, many collisions and struggles. The Jewish apostles preserved the historical connection between the present and the past, the new revelation and the old, both of which in fact came from the same God. Thus they put a salutary check upon the bold spirit of freedom and independence. The Gentile apostle gave free scope to the creative energy of Christianity, thus preventing stagnation and relapse into religious pupillage and national exclusiveness.

In this living organism of the primitive Christian doctrine we see only a new proof of its divinity, universality, and inexhaustible fulness. The magical introduction of one fixed, abstract

system of ideas into the heads of the apostles, regardless of their gifts, education, and mission, would have been unworthy as well of God as of man. Instead of this we have the eternal Truth becoming flesh, entering into essential conjunction with human nature, inwardly and vitally uniting itself with the individuality of each apostle, and expressing itself in the way most suitable to him and those of like mental character. In every one there is accomplished a true, free reconciliation between his mind and God's, between reason and revelation, nature and grace. Here again, therefore, must we repeat, that in the Bible all is divine and at the same time truly human, and for this very reason most admirably fitted to meet the deepest wants of our nature, and to reconcile man with God.

§ 157. (1) *The Jewish-Christian Type of Doctrine.*

The Jewish-Christian system of doctrine looks upon the New Testament in its closest connection with the Old, as the fulfilment and completion of the old dispensation. It was, therefore, peculiarly adapted to win to the Gospel the Jews, who were possessed with a holy awe of the records of their religion and were immovably persuaded of their divine origin.

But the Old Testament itself presents two aspects, *law* and *prophecy*. In both it prepares the way for Christianity; in the law, by eliciting and strengthening the sense of sin and of the need of redemption; in prophecy, by the cultivation of hope and desire for the promised redemption from the curse of the law. Hence also the Gospel might be set forth predominantly either in its affinity with the Mosaic law, or in its agreement with the prophetic Scriptures. This gives us the two mutually complete forms of Jewish Christianity; the first appearing in James, the second in Peter. The legal Jewish Christianity is more anthropological; the prophetic is Messianic or Christological. Hence in James the doctrine of the person and work of Christ is far less prominent than in Peter.¹

¹ Dr Dorner has the same view of this relation in his *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2d ed. I. p. 97: "If James clings more to the law, though not to the ceremonial law, but to the eternal moral law embodied in it, whose ideal existence becomes through Christ reality in the free man, in love; Peter sees in Christianity above all the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, as much in his

A second distinction between James and Peter, closely connected with this, is, that the former is still more strictly Jewish than the latter in doctrine and practice, and that Peter, after the conversion of Cornelius, as his appearance at the apostolic council and his epistles sufficiently show, forms the connecting link between James and Paul, between the church of the Jewish, and the church of the Gentile Christians. The two must accordingly be separately considered.¹

§ 158. (a) *Legal Jewish Christianity, or the Doctrinal System of James.* (Comp. § 95 and 96).

The sources of our knowledge of this doctrinal type are the epistle of James to the dispersed Jewish-Christian congregations and his address at the apostolic council, in connection with what we learn from Acts xxi., Gal. ii., and some later accounts, respecting his position in general in the apostolic church.

James the Just we know already as a strict legalist, who after Peter's removal to other lands, A.D. 44 (Acts xii. 17), presided over the church of Jerusalem and of all Palestinian Christianity, down almost to the great catastrophe, and stood as mediator between Jews and Christians. In conformity with this character, education, and office, he conceives *objective* Christianity as *law* (James i. 25 ; ii. 12), thus standing on the ground of the Mosaic system, while at the same time he rises above it in representing Christianity as the "*perfect law of liberty.*"² From this we gather, that he regards Judaism as imperfect and as a law of bondage, though prudence forbids his expressly saying so. Then again, he does not mean by this law the mass of ceremonial precepts, nor does he anywhere intimate, that the observance of

discourses in Acts as in his epistles." For the above view of the relation of Peter's doctrinal system to that of James, I am indebted substantially to the oral instruction of my respected and beloved teacher, the late Dr C. Fr. Schmid of Tübingen, one of the most solid and pious, but also one of the most modest and silent theologians of Germany. It is much to be lamented, for the interests of the church and of sound theology, that he did not before his death (1852) publish his excellent lectures on the Biblical Theology of the New Testament and on the Epistle to the Romans.

¹ It is a singular defect in the epoch-forming work of Dr Neander on the Apostolic Church, that it entirely passes over the doctrinal system of Peter, while yet it treats of that of James quite at large.

² James i. 25: *Εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας*, where *νόμος* refers to *λόγος*, ver. 23, and to *λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας*, ver. 18.

these is, as the heretical Jewish Christians and the later Ebionites asserted, essential to salvation. On the contrary he agreed with Peter and Paul at the apostolic council in acknowledging the uncircumcised Gentile converts as brethren and members of Christ's church. He views the law in its deep moral import, and as such an organic unit, that whoever transgresses a single precept, violates the whole, and incurs the full penalty (ii. 10, 11). With him the soul of the law, which animates and binds together all its parts, is love. This he therefore styles the "royal law," or the all-ruling, fundamental law in the kingdom of God.¹ He even reaches the view that Christianity is a new creation; though the further development of this is left to be the special work of Paul. James, for example, reminds his readers, that God has begotten them according to His gracious will by the word of truth (by which we can only understand the Gospel), so that they are the first-fruits of His creatures, the crown of the creation (i. 18); and this engrafted word, abiding in the souls of believers, he represents as able to save.² Thus the Gospel is, in his view, an efficient, creative, saving principle. Such hints place his elevation above Ebionism and the genuinely Christian ground-work of his much mistaken epistle beyond all doubt. But the legal, practical view of morality is unquestionably the predominant one. He contents himself with furnishing a commentary on our Lord's significant words: "I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it."

In harmony with this, James, in his exhortations, gives special prominence to the dealings of God with men as Lawgiver and Judge, and often refers to the sternness of His justice and holiness, of which the law is the expression,³ though without overlooking His long-suffering and mercy.⁴ The doctrine of the person and the work of Christ, on the contrary, particularly of His sacerdotal office, is left quite in the back ground; though it should not here be forgotten, that the epistle is short, and presupposes an acquaintance with the Gospel history. This consid-

¹ James ii. 5. Comp. the precisely similar declarations of our Lord, Matth. xxii. 39. John xiii. 35, and of Paul, Gal. v. 14. Rom. xiii. 8-10. 1 Cor. xiii. 1, *et seq.*

² James i. 21: Τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι.

³ James iv. 12; i. 13, 17; ii. 13.

⁴ James i. 5, 17; v. 11, 15.

eration is necessary to give it its full meaning. The proper name of the Redeemer occurs only twice, viz., in the superscription, i. 1, where James humbly terms himself “a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ,” and in ii. 1, where he describes Christ as “the Lord of glory;” thus in both instances mentioning the Saviour with the greatest reverence and with allusion to His royal dignity. Elsewhere he employs the solemn title of honour, “Lord” (v. 7, 8, 11, 15), which in this sense, especially in the mouth of a Jew, can be used only of a divine being. Christ’s atoning death¹ and resurrection are, indeed, passed over in silence, but instead of them His second coming to judgment, which of course presupposes them, is clearly set forth (v. 7, 8).

With this view of objective Christianity perfectly corresponds that here presented of *subjective* Christianity or personal religion. The law requires actual observance and fulfilment, a conduct conformed to its precepts. Hence James’ hostility to all lifeless intellectual and nominal Christianity, and his earnest stress on works, the fruits of faith, the palpable proof of justification.² And as he sees in the law an indivisible unit, so he requires the Christian life to be one effusion, one complete and faultless work.³ Finally, as with him the sum and substance of the law is love, so the fulfilling of the law consists in undivided love to God and our neighbour, with which the love of the world and of self is absolutely incompatible (iv. 4, *et seq.*; ii. 8). Consequently James places the essence of the Christian religion in a holy, irreproachable walk of love, and of a love too based ultimately on a new birth (i. 17, 18, 21), and on faith in Christ, the Lord of glory (ii. 1, 22.)

These are the leading thoughts of the epistle of James. The book is, on the one hand, a voice of persuasion to Jews and Jewish-Christian readers, leading them to the threshold of the “holiest of all,” showing them, as through a narrow crevice, the glory of the new covenant and of the ideal law of liberty, and

¹ In chap. v. 11, it is true, the τέλος κυρίου is spoken of; but according to the context this would present the Lord’s death only in its representative aspect, as a model of patience under suffering. Some commentators refer the words not to Christ at all but to the issue, with which the gracious God crowned the sufferings of Job.

² James i. 3-6; ii. 1, *et seq.*; 14, *et seq.*; iii. 1, *et seq.*

³ James i. 4, 14, *et seq.* Έργον τέλειον . . . ἵνα ᾗτε τέλειοι καὶ ὁλόκληροι, ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι. Comp. Matth. v. 48.

awakening a desire for the full possession ; and, on the other, it still comes to us as an earnest exhortation to holy living, and especially as a warning to all who content themselves with mere theory and the oral profession of Christianity, and seek to escape the discipline of the law, wholesome and necessary even for believers. James is the apostle of the law in its pedagogical import, as leading to Christ, regulating the Christian life, and promoting moral earnestness.

§ 159. *James and Paul.*

Finally, as to the much-talked-of relation between the doctrinal systems of James and Paul. It must certainly be admitted, that the two systems, especially in their soteriology, are constructed from entirely different points of view ; the positions, also, and missions of the two being quite distinct. Yet if we logically follow out their principles, taking into account the whole mental state of each writer, we shall find that in all essential points they ultimately coincide.

Both James and Paul have in view particularly the relation of the Gospel to the law and to the wants and the moral destiny of man ; and thus both treat of religion mainly in its anthropological aspect. But while James, in opposition to an unproductive formalism of knowledge without works, presents the Gospel in its union with the law, and even calls it a law ; Paul, in opposition to a hypocritical formalism of works without faith, contends against the law as a letter which “ killeth ” (2 Cor. iii. 6), and as a yoke of bondage (Gal. v. 1). They plainly differ, therefore, as well in their theses as in their antitheses. We have already seen, however, that James has not his eye upon external ceremonies in the Judaizing and Ebionistic sense, but goes back to the unchangeable moral principle of the law as regenerated by the Gospel, and derives the Christian life ultimately from a new creation by the gracious will of God. Paul, on the other hand, gives no countenance whatever to antinomianism. He too speaks of a “ law of faith ” (Rom. iii. 27), a “ law of Christ ” (Gal. vi. 2), and a “ law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,” which makes us free from the “ law of sin and death ” (Rom. viii. 2) ; thus approaching from another point of view the same ideal conception of law.

In the same way may be solved the apparent contradiction between their respective views of subjective Christianity. This conflict, it is well known, is most violent in the doctrine of *justification*, as well in the proposition¹ as in the argument and the application of the examples of Abraham² and Rahab.³ We cannot, indeed, consistently with any unprejudiced view, compose the difference by considering both apostles as saying precisely the same thing. Here also they occupy entirely different points of view, and are contending against opposite errors. James insists especially on good *works*, on acting out justification in the life, in opposition to a dead orthodoxy, a purely intellectual faith, which is in fact no faith at all, at least none that can justify or save. "Thou believest," he addresses these conceited theoretical formalists, "that there is one God; thou doest well." "The devils," he adds, with cutting irony, "also believe and tremble" (ii. 19). Paul, on the contrary, lays chief stress on true living *faith* and the divine ground of justification, to exclude all boasting, all Pharisaical self-righteousness and hypocrisy. But on the other hand, James also recognises the true living faith which prompts to good works, completes itself in them (ii. 22), produces patience and thereby a perfect work (i. 3, *et seq.*), and secures the hearing of prayer (i. 5, *et seq.*; v. 15). So he acknowledges the imperfection of man even in the state of grace, including himself in the universal sinfulness (iii. 2). He, therefore, especially with his profound conception of the law as an inseparable unit, can expect final salvation from no human work, however good, but derives it from the regenerating power of the Gospel, from the free will of God (i. 17, 18, 21; ii. 5); and his last resort is the mercy of the Lord (v. 11), the giver of every good and perfect gift, who is ready to hear the prayer of unwavering faith (i. 5, 17). The apostle of the Gentiles also, on his part, calls a faith without charity, such as James supposes in his antagonists, vain, a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal (1 Cor. xiii. 1, *et seq.*); and with all his zeal for salvation by free, unmerited grace, he most emphatically requires good works as

¹ James ii. 24 : Ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον. Comp. Rom. iii. 28 : Λογιζόμεθα οὖν, πίστις δικαιοῦσθαι ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.

² James ii. 21, *et seq.* Rom. iv. 1, *et seq.* Gal. iii. 6.

³ James ii. 25. Heb. xi. 31.

the indispensable fruit of faith. For faith in fact, if it be worthy of the name, is with him always a vital appropriation of the merits of Christ, a union of the soul with Him, continually working by love (Gal. ii. 20; v. 6. 1 Thess. i. 3, etc.)

The relation, therefore, between the two apostles—as well their difference as their agreement—may be thus stated:—James proceeds from without inward, from phenomenon to principle, from periphery to centre, from the fruit to the tree; Paul, on the contrary, proceeds from within outward, from principle to phenomenon, from centre to circumference, from the root to the blossom and the fruit. Paul's view is unquestionably deeper, more philosophical, and more fundamental than the other, and very far in advance of it; yet the empirical method of James also has its proper office and its practical necessity. It may even serve as a corrective to Paul's view, wherever the latter by abuse becomes indifferent to works, and degenerates either into unproductive theoretical orthodoxy, or into licentious practical antinomianism—two diseased forms of Christianity, which have in fact more than once arisen from an imperfect understanding of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. On all pseudo-Pauline excesses James imposes a necessary and wholesome restraint.

§ 160. (b) *Prophetic Jewish Christianity, or the Doctrinal System of Peter.* (Comp. § 89–94).

The doctrine of Peter we gather from his discourses in the book of Acts, and from his two circular letters to the mixed churches of Asia Minor. This apostle distinguishes himself, even in the gospels, by enthusiastic love for Christ, and clear views of His higher nature and divine mission, such as expressed themselves in that memorable confession, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” His discourses and epistles are but a continuous commentary, so to speak, a practical, edifying exposition of this great confession. Hence they everywhere have the Messianic or Christological element in the foreground,—a decided advance on the legal Jewish Christianity. True, he stood at first on the level of the Mosaic system, and considered circumcision the only door to the Christian church. But the decisive vision in Joppa, and the occurrences in the house of Cornelius (comp. § 60) had raised him above this

Jewish prejudice, and at the apostolic council he advocated the genuine Pauline maxim, that all, Jews as well as Gentiles, are saved, not by the law, but by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts xv. 10, 11). In his subsequent labours, too, he did not confine himself, like James, to his countrymen and to Palestine, but interested himself also for Gentiles and Gentile Christians. Those churches of Asia Minor, to which he wrote his epistles, were mostly of Paul's planting. In his outward position, therefore, as well as in his views, he holds, as already observed, a middle place between James and Paul.

The fundamental idea of Peter's doctrinal system is the truth, that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised *Messiah*, and Christianity a *fulfilment* of Old Testament *prophecy*. This is necessarily the primary form of christology. The first thing was to convince the Jews, who were looking for salvation in the Messiah, that all the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled in the crucified and risen Jesus, and that in Him, therefore, the desired salvation had actually appeared. This is the burden of all Peter's discourses in the Acts. All the prophets, he says, from Samuel down, prophesied of Jesus Christ and the events of the apostolic age (Acts iii. 24), and hence there is salvation in no other; there is no other name given among men, whereby we must be saved (iii. 12). In all the leading facts of the Gospel history, especially in the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, in His exaltation to the right hand of God, and in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, Peter sees the fulfilment of one or more Old Testament predictions.¹ He has a predilection also for prophetic expressions to denote Christ, such as "Servant of God,"² whom God "hath anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power" (Acts x. 38; comp. iv. 27). This view of Christ, however, in His relation to Jewish history, though decidedly the prevailing view with Peter, is not his only one. He at times approaches the ideal christology of John, and teaches with tolerable clearness the pre-existence of the Redeemer. Christianity, according to Peter, does not exist

¹ Comp. Acts ii. 16, *et seq.*; 25, *et seq.*; 34, *et seq.*; iii. 18, 22, *et seq.*; iv. 11, 25, *et seq.*; x. 43; xv. 7, *et seq.* 1 Peter i. 10, *et seq.*; 24, *et seq.*; ii. 4, *et seq.*; 9, *et seq.*; 22, *et seq.*; iii. 22; iv. 17. 2 Peter i. 18, *et seq.*

² Παῖς θεοῦ, Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30, a term, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but frequently in Isaiah (LXX), to denote the Messiah. Comp. Isa. xlii. 1; lii. 13; liii. 11.

for the sake of Judaism, nor as a product of it ; rather is Judaism a product of Christianity. This is implied particularly in the profound passage, 1 Peter i. 10–12 (comp. i. 20, and 2 Peter i. 19–21), according to which the same spirit of Christ, which afterwards appeared as a person, was already in the prophets, operating in them from the beginning as the principle of revelation, pointing to the future historical manifestation of the Saviour—the all-controlling principle, which Judaism had to serve in a merely provisional way.

This fulfilment of the Old Testament in the Gospel, however, Peter regards, not as finished with the first appearance of the Lord, but rather as itself an unfulfilled *prophecy*. As James calls Christianity a law, so Peter considers it a promise or prophecy, the precious earnest of a still more glorious future. This is an essential element of his view. Even in his discourse to the people, Acts iii. 20, *et seq.*, he points to a still future time of refreshing, a restoration of the physical and moral world to the state of perfection,¹ to be accomplished at the visible return of Christ, who now fills heaven,²—a time when all the predictions of the holy prophets of God shall be completely realized. What is foretold in the Old Testament is, therefore, only partially realized. The epistles of Peter are full of this prophetic element, which is well suited to their practical purpose of consolation, and of encouragement to persevere under suffering. At the very beginning of the first epistle he presents the Christian salvation as an object of lively hope, as an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us (1 Peter i. 3, 4). It is to be revealed in the last time (ver. 5), at the approaching end of all things, when Christ shall appear in His glory (iv. 13 ; comp. v. 1). The faithful pastors shall receive crowns of glory at the appearance of the chief shepherd (v. 4 ; comp. ver. 6) ; and, with this prospect of the eternal glory of God in Christ, to which we are called, the epistle concludes

¹ Ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, comp. παλιγγενεσία, Matth. xix. 28, and καιροὶ διορθώσεως, Heb. ix. 10.

² In interpreting the words ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι, Acts iii. 21, I think the Lutheran commentators correct, in making ὃν the subject : Who must receive heaven, instead of :—Whom the heaven must receive, quem oportet coelo capi, as the Greek and most of the Reformed commentators explain it, and as it is given in the English Bible. For the throne occupies not the king, but the king the throne.

(v. 10) as it had begun. The second epistle also frequently speaks of promises given (i. 4), and of a future entrance into the everlasting kingdom of Christ (ver. 11). The word of the prophets has, indeed, been made surer by being partially fulfilled, but is still prophetic, continually shining as a light in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in the heart (ver. 19). The last chapter treats almost exclusively of the revelation of this glorious future, and closes with the prospect of the new heavens and new earth (iv. 12, 13), and with an appropriate exhortation.

It is in perfect accordance with this conception of the Gospel that Peter represents the Christian *life*, in the first place, indeed, as penitent *faith* in the revealed Messiah, the only Saviour,¹ but at the same time as lively *hope* for the glorious return of the Lord, and the consummation of salvation thereby to be accomplished.² Hence his predilection for the title “strangers and pilgrims” in addressing Christians.³ Hence his earnestness in exhorting them to be patient in suffering and tribulation, after the example of Christ. On account of this frequent reference to hope, which is based on the resurrection of Christ (1 Peter i. 3), is a foretaste of the future inheritance, and, for this very reason consoles and refreshes amidst the trials of the earthly pilgrimage, Peter has been called, not improperly, the apostle of hope.⁴

Thus, according to the Petrine type of doctrine, objective Christianity is at once a fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy, and itself a precious promise; subjective Christianity is at once faith in the revealed Messiah, and lively hope in His glorious reappearance.

Other books of the New Testament also present Christianity in this prospective form, which, however, looks not beyond Christ, but only to the perfect unfolding of what is in Him. The most complete expansion of this prophetic view is given, in a certain manner, by John in the Apocalypse; but Paul also is

¹ Acts ii. 38; iii. 16; iv. 12; x. 43; xv. 9. 1 Peter i. 5, 7-9, 21; ii. 7. 2 Peter i. 1.

² 1 Peter i. 3, 13, 21; iii. 5, 15; iv. 13; v. 1, 4, 10. 2 Peter i. 19; iii. 9-13.

³ 1 Peter i. 1, 2; ii. 11. Comp. 2 Peter i. 13, *et seq.*

⁴ By Beck, for example, in his *Einleitung in das System der christlichen Lehre*, p. 245.

full of the future glorious consummation of the church, and hence with him hope, the confident, ardent, not painful, however, but joyful and elevating expectation of the full possession of the promise, holds a necessary place in the Christian life.¹ Here again we observe the most beautiful harmony among all the apostles.

§ 161. *Matthew, Mark, and Jude.*

Those of the other New Testament books, which are conformed to this Jewish-Christian type of the apostolic doctrine, are the gospels of Matthew and Mark, which form its historical foundation, and the epistle of Jude. In one view the Apocalypse also might be included here, as agreeing in its contents with the prophetic strain of Peter; but in other respects it bears throughout the stamp of the Johannean theology. Between the first and second gospels, again, there is the same relation as between James and Peter.

Matthew evidently wrote for Jewish Christians, and presumes upon a knowledge of the peculiar customs and usages of the Jews; while Mark, who, like his spiritual father, Peter, has in view a larger and in part Gentile-Christian circle of readers, frequently explains such Jewish peculiarities. Both choose the ethical discourses of Jesus, in which He presents himself as the fulfiller and completer of the Old Testament law. They are comprehended particularly in the sermon on the mount (Matth. v.—vii.), which seems to have been floating in the mind of James while writing his epistle. His coincidence with Matthew extends even to single precepts, such as the prohibition of swearing, as also to the sententious, figurative character of the language.² But the first two gospels also furnish a complement to the doctrine of James in a Christological point of view, by making Christ not merely the fulfiller of the law, but, with as much emphasis as Peter, the fulfiller of prophecy. Matthew in particular,

¹ Comp. Rom. v. 2; viii. 18, 23-25; xii. 12; xv. 13. 1 Cor. ix. 10; xiii. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 12. Eph. i. 18; ii. 12; iv. 4. Col. i. 5, 23; iii. 3, 4. 1 Thess i. 3; v. 8, 9. 2 Thess. ii. 16. 1 Tim. i. 1. Titus i. 2; ii. 13; iii. 7. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Heb. vi. 11; x. 23. 1 John iii. 2, 3.

² Respecting the relation of the epistle of James to the gospel of Matthew, compare, for example, Theile's Commentary on the former, where the parallels are given at large.

in all the leading events of the evangelical history, takes pains to call attention to their remarkable coincidence with prophecies, by the standing phrase: "that it might be fulfilled, which is written;"¹ and thus to give his Jewish readers proof that Jesus was the promised Messiah and King of the Jews (i. 1). But at the same time he, like Peter, holds up Christianity as itself again a prophecy, and hence carefully records the prophetic discourses of our Lord respecting His second coming (chaps. xxiv. and xxv.; comp. Mark xiii.) Mark does not so often cite special prophecies, though he refers at the very outset to Mal. iii. 1 and Isaiah xl. 3. To his readers of heathen descent, and with a view to their doctrine of the sons of the gods, he wishes to show, that Jesus is not only the Messiah and the "Son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matth. i. 1), but emphatically the "Son of God" (Mark i. 1), and has accredited himself as such by His very appearance and His works of supernatural power. It is for this reason, that Mark gives the Gospel history such a vivacious, dramatic form, setting it before the eyes of his readers in a series of detached and complete pictures. In general, the first two evangelists are confined to the historical, Messianic aspect of the Redeemer; though they touch at times the eternal, divine groundwork of His person, and thus serve to introduce the Johannean Christology, which at the same time presupposes their existence (comp. § 148).

The short, but earnest and forcible epistle of Jude reveals even in its superscription its affinity to James both in matter and in form. In its contents, however, it comes still nearer the second epistle of Peter, the existence of which it implies (comp. § 92). The main design is to warn its readers against libertine false teachers and wanton abuse of grace. The examples adduced are all from the Old Testament; and he even makes use of the Jewish tradition in his allusion to the dispute between the archangel Michael, and the devil about the body of Moses (ver. 9), and appeals to the apocryphal book of Enoch (ver. 14), though of course without thereby sanctioning it in general or conceding to it canonical authority.² The specifically Christian element is

¹ E. g. i. 23; ii. 6, 15, 18; iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 35; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56; xxvii. 9.

² Comp. the exposition of these passages and the removal of all that appears offen-

most apparent at the close (verses 20–25), though it shines through not indistinctly in other places. In ver. 2 Jesus Christ is associated immediately with God the Father, and in ver. 4 is termed “our only Ruler and Lord” (comp. verses 17, 21, 25). Jude also, like James, points to the second coming of Christ in judgment, which will be terrible to the ungodly (verses 14, 15), but to believers full of grace unto eternal life (ver. 21). Significant and very appropriate is the position of this letter—“of few lines, but rich in words of heavenly grace”¹—in the canon, between the apostolic epistles, to which it makes corroborate reference (verses 3, 17, *et seq.*), and the Apocalypse, to which, by its earnest predictions respecting the last enemies of the church and their impending judgment, it forms the transition.

§ 162. (2) *The Gentile-Christian Type of Doctrine in Paul.*
(Comp. § 62–88).

From the great apostle of the Gentiles, who was naturally a profound thinker and had enjoyed a learned education, we have by far the most extended and complete exhibition of the Christian system of doctrine; as in fact this apostle wrote more than all the rest. He unfolds Christianity mainly in its specific character, which, though organically adapted, it is true, to the wants of human nature and to the Old Testament revelation, is still infinitely exalted above both Heathenism and Judaism, and cannot, therefore, be derived from either. Christ is, with Paul, in the fullest sense, a second progenitor of humanity; the Christian religion, a new moral creation far transcending the old.

The doctrinal position of this apostle may be accounted for, not only by his calling, but also by the mode of his conversion, in which the Jewish and the Christian life came so abruptly and violently into contact. A regular, bigoted Pharisee, in doctrine and sentiment (though by birth a Hellenist), a fanatical zealot for the law of his fathers, the most dangerous enemy of the Christian church, he was suddenly converted to the Gospel by the grace of God, and called by the exalted Redeemer to be the apostle of the Gentiles. If he was before, as he himself says, a blasphemer and

sive in them by Stier: *Der Brief Judä, des Bruders des Herrn* (1850), p. 51, *et seq.*, and p. 81, *et seq.*

¹ As Origen says of it, *Comment. in Matth.* XIII.

a persecutor,¹ though from blindness and ignorance; the more abundantly and illustriously did he prove the saving mercy of God. If he had formerly striven in vain after righteousness by the law, and had now attained it without merit, of pure grace, by simple faith in Christ crucified and risen; he was compelled to view his former condition in comparison with his present, as dark night compared with noon-day (2 Cor. iv. 6); nay, to count all his Jewish advantages but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, his Lord (comp. Phil. iii. 3-9 and Rom. vii. 13-25).

Accordingly Paul's doctrine, like his life, centres in the great antithesis of the *want of salvation before Christ* and the *supply of salvation in Christ*. Before Christ and out of Christ is, with him, the reign of sin and death; after Christ and in Christ, the reign of righteousness and life (Rom. v. 12, *et seq.*) There he sees the killing letter; here the lifegiving Spirit.² There, bondage and curse; here, freedom and blessed sonship.³ There, a powerless struggle between flesh and spirit and a cry for redemption;⁴ here, no condemnation, but wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, and the inseparable communion of the love of God which is in Christ Jesus.⁵ Hence he opposes no error so decidedly and vehemently as the Judaizing, which would degrade Christianity to the former level of bondage and death.

Much as Paul insists, however, on the absolute newness of Christianity and its infinite elevation, not only above Heathenism, but also above Judaism, he still forgets not its historical and religious connection with the Old Testament. He does not regard it as new in any such sense, as would make its appearance in the world altogether unprepared, abrupt and magical. He gives it, in the first place, an organic connection with the natural man's need of redemption, which even the heathen, by reason of the innate idea of God and the law written in the conscience,⁶ cannot deny. Then again, he represents the way as positively prepared for the Christian religion by the Old Testament revelation.

¹ Βλάσφημος καὶ διώκτης καὶ ὑβριστής, 1 Tim. i. 13.

² Rom. viii. 2; vii. 6. 2 Cor. iii. 6, *et seq.*

³ Gal. v. 1; iv. 3, *et seq.*; iii. 10, *et seq.* 2 Cor. iii. 17.

⁴ Rom. vii. 7, *et seq.*; 24.

⁵ Rom. viii. 1, *et seq.* 1 Cor. i. 30.

⁶ Rom. i. 19. Acts xvii. 23, 28; and Rom. ii. 14, 15.

He calls the law a schoolmaster to lead to Christ (Gal. iii. 24), and describes the Gospel as promised before by the prophets.¹ There is, therefore, a connecting link between the Jew Saul and the Christian Paul, between the two stages of his religious experience and views. This link is the idea of *righteousness*, which forms the centre and fundamental principle of his system of faith and morals. While a Pharisee, he had striven with all his might after righteousness in the way of obedience to the law of Moses. Even his persecution of Christ, whom he took for a revolutionary opponent of the Old Testament religion, proceeded from this honest effort. But in *faith* in the very One he persecuted he found righteousness, and with it peace and salvation.² We must, therefore, examine more closely this important conception.

The notion of *righteousness* (δικαιοσύνη, דִּקְיָאוּסֻנָּה) is borrowed from the Old Testament, where it denotes the ideal of the theocratic morality and religion, legal perfection, the proper, normal relation of man to a just and holy God. For this very reason it is inseparably connected with true life, with salvation, felicity, as its necessary consequence.³ The rule and measure of this relation is the will or judgment of God expressed in the law. Hence righteousness, in the Jewish view, consists in the perfect fulfilling of the law (Rom. ii. 13). The *just* man (δίκαιος, דִּקְיָאִים) is one, who in disposition and action is as he should be⁴ in the sight of

¹ Rom. i. 2; iii. 21. Titus i. 2. 2 Cor. i. 20.

² The Swiss divine, Usteri, to whom we owe the first organic development of Paul's doctrinal system, divides it altogether abstractly into two parts very unequal in compass: (1) the ante-Christian period (Heathenism and Judaism); (2) Christianity;—without uniting the two by any intermediate conception. Neander makes the δικαιοσύνη this connecting link, and thus effects an advance in the whole view of Paul's system, *Apost. Gesch.* II. p. 656, where he says: "The ideas of νόμος and δικαιοσύνη connect, as well as divide, his earlier and later views." The idea of νόμος, however, seems to me to belong rather to the first main division, the ante-Christian, Jewish position.

³ Comp. Lev. xviii. 5. James i. 25. Rom. iv. 4; x. 5. Gal. iii. 12. Phil. iii. 6.

⁴ This, too, is the original meaning of the German "gerecht" and the English "righteous," though they are now commonly made to refer, not to the moral and religious relations, but merely to the judicial or legal. The corresponding Greek word Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* V. 2) derives from δίχα (δῖς), twofold, in two parts; so that δικαιοσύνη would be the well-proportioned relation between two parts, where each has its due. It may then be applied as well to the relation of a man to God, as to his relation to other men, or even to both at once; and with the Greeks δίκαιος is frequently one who fulfils his obligations to God and man. It was a Greek proverb: "In righteousness all virtue is contained;" and Aristotle says, *Eth. Nic.* V. 3: Πάντα τὰ νόμιμά ἐστί πῶς δίκαια . . . ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἐνι.

God. On him rests the pleasure of the Lord. He has claim to all the blessings and privileges of the theocracy (Gal. iii. 12); while the unrighteous man is under the curse of God, condemned, and miserable (Gal. iii. 10).

The Saviour also, in His sermon on the mount, represents righteousness as the chief end of man: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness" (Matth. vi. 33). But He here distinguishes two kinds of righteousness: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matth. v. 20). The Pharisaic righteousness stands in letter; the Christian, in spirit. The one is self-righteousness; the other, a gift of grace, given to those who are poor in spirit, who, with the publican, penitently smite upon their breasts, and under a sense of entire unworthiness put up the prayer: "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke xviii. 13, 14).

It is precisely this distinction, which forms the basis of Paul's minute analysis of doctrine, and which separates the two great periods of his life. Before his conversion he was with the Jews in the view, that man can actually fulfil the divine law, and therefore attain in this way righteousness and salvation.¹ After his conversion he saw this to be absolutely impossible without faith in Christ and the renewal of the whole man. Now he learned, that all men, Jews as well as Gentiles, are by nature without righteousness, and can be made righteous and be saved only through the merits of Jesus Christ. If he had previously laid the chief stress on the law and on works, he now laid it all on free grace, and on living faith, which appropriates Christ and His atoning death. Hence he may justly be called the apostle of faith, or of the righteousness of faith.

Paul accordingly distinguishes two kinds of righteousness: (1) man's own righteousness,² or the righteousness of the law, also called righteousness of works,³ which man strives after, but in reality can never attain, by his natural power, and which is therefore altogether imaginary.⁴ The ground of this impossi-

¹ Acts xxii. 3. Gal. i. 13, *et seq.* Phil. iii. 4, *et seq.*

² Ἰδία δικαιοσύνη, Rom. x. 3. Phil. iii. 9.

³ Δικαιοσύνη ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, Rom. iii. 2; x. 5. Gal. ii. 21.

⁴ Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16, 21.

bility of a self-righteousness, which would stand before God and establish a claim to salvation, is not in the law—for this is good, holy, spiritual (Rom. vii. 12, 14),—but in the corruption of man, in his carnal nature, which must be regenerated and renewed by the grace of God, before it can perform anything truly good. (2) The righteousness of God or from God, *i.e.*, the righteousness which comes from God and is acceptable to him;¹ or the righteousness of faith,² *i.e.*, the righteousness which springs from faith in Christ, as the only and all-sufficient Saviour; is vitally apprehended by faith, and is imputed and given to the believer by God, without merit, without the deeds of the law, in free grace.³ The righteousness of faith also, being of this character, necessarily excludes all boasting, and yields the glory to God alone (Rom. iii. 27).

The divine act, by which man comes into possession of this righteousness, is denoted by the expressions: *justification, to justify, to count for righteousness*.⁴ This Pauline doctrine of justification is evidently founded on the notion of a judicial process. The holy and just God is the judge;⁵ the law of God, the

¹ Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, δικ. ἐκ θεοῦ, Gal. iii. 11. Rom. i. 17; iii. 21, 22; x. 3. 2 Cor. v. 21. Phil. iii. 9.

² Δικαιοσύνη τῆς πίστεως, or ἐκ πίστεως, or διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, Rom. ix. 30; x. 6; i. 17. Gal. v. 5. Phil. iii. 9.

³ Οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, Gal. ii. 16, comp. Eph. ii. 9: δωρεάν, Rom. ii. 24; τῇ χάριτι, ib. and Eph. ii. 9; κατὰ χάριν, Rom. iv. 4.

⁴ Δικαίωσις λογισμὸς πῆς δικαιοσύνης, δικαιοῦν (דִּקְיָוּן), λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, Rom. ii. 13; v. 18; iii. 20. Gal. iii. 11, etc. Δικαιοῦν properly means, according to its etymology, to *make* righteous, like the Latin (which, by the way, does not occur in the profane authors) *justificare*=*justum facere* (comp. *calefacere*, *frigifacere*, *vivificare*, etc.) For all Greek verbs in ὡ, derived from adjectives of the second declension signify, to make a person or thing what the primitive denotes. Thus τυφλοῦν, δουλοῦν, ὀρθοῦν, βεβηλοῦν, δηλοῦν, φανεροῦν, τελειοῦν, κενοῦν, are equivalent to τυφλόν, δοῦλον, ὀρθόν, etc. ποιεῖν. Now this making righteous may be done primarily in the judicial sense; and then it will be the same as: to *pronounce* righteous, *justum declarare*, and as such termini forenses the Hebrew דִּקְיָוּן and the Greek δικαιοῦν, in the Hellenistic Biblical usus loquendi, frequently occur: *e.g.* Exod. xxiii. 7. Deut. xxv. 1. 1 Kings viii. 32. Prov. xvii. 15. Ps. cxliii. 2; li. 6. Ezek. xvi. 51. Isa. xlv. 25. Luke vii. 29. Rom. iii. 4. 1 Tim. iii. 16. Matth. xi. 19. Luke x. 29; xvi. 12. Rom. ii. 13. Matth. xii. 37. 1 Cor. iv. 4. But if we would not involve God in inconsistency and falsehood, we must carefully guard against the notion of an empty declaration, and must necessarily suppose that the objective state of things corresponds to the judgment of God; in other words, that God actually *makes* the penitent sinner righteous in imputing and imparting to him the righteousness of Christ, renewing him by the Holy Ghost, and placing him by faith in holy vital communion with Christ.

⁵ Rom. iii. 20. Gal. iii. 11. 1 Cor. iv. 4. 2 Tim. iv. 8.

accuser;¹ the sinner or transgressor of the law, the accused;² conscience, the witness;³ Christ the advocate and substitute for the accused;⁴ the atoning death and the merits of Christ, the price of redemption;⁵ faith, the instrument, the spiritual hand of the penitent sinner, by which these merits are appropriated.⁶ The justification itself is (1) negative, the judicial sentence of God, in which He pronounces the sinner, for the sake of Christ, free from the curse of the law, from the guilt and punishment of transgression;—in other words, the forgiveness of sins, pardon;⁷ (2) positive, the imputation and actual communication of the righteousness of Christ to the penitent, believing sinner.⁸ The communication on the part of God and appropriation on the part of man, take place by means of faith, which is wrought by the Holy Ghost in the church through the word and the sacraments, and is, not indeed the objective ground, the efficient cause, yet the indispensable subjective condition and instrumental cause, of justification; since, renouncing all merit of its own, it lays vital hold on the grace of God and the merits of Christ, and receives them into itself. By faith the man is raised out of his sinful state, united with Christ, and wrought more and more into His holy being, so that the old man no longer lives, but Christ lives and moves in him.⁹ Of course such a faith is absolutely inseparable from love and good works.¹⁰ An antinomian disjunction of faith from its fruits, as also of justification from sanctification, is a radical and most dangerous abuse of Paul's doctrine, which he himself repelled with horror.¹¹

In this comprehensive moral contrast between false self-righteousness, which works death, and the true righteousness of God, which is life and salvation, Paul's whole system centres. It may, therefore, be best presented in two sections. The first or nega-

¹ Col. ii. 14. Comp. John v. 45.

² Rom. iii. 19.

³ Rom. ii. 15.

⁴ 1 John ii. 1. Comp. Heb. vii. 25, *et seq.*; ix. 24.

⁵ Titus ii. 14. Comp. Matth. xx. 28. Mark x. 45.

⁶ Rom. i. 17; iii. 21. Phil. iii. 9.

⁷ Ἀφίσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τῶν παραπτωμάτων, Rom. iv. 6, 7. Comp. Luke xviii. 13, 14.

⁸ Λογισμὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης, Rom. iv. 3, 6, 7, 11, 24; ix. 30. Gal. iii. 6.

⁹ Gal. ii. 20. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 15, 17. 2 Cor. iii. 18. Eph. iii. 17; v. 30. Col. iii. 3, 4.

¹⁰ Comp. Gal. v. 6. Rom. vi. 1, *et seq.*

¹¹ Rom. iii. 8; vi. 1, 2. Comp. 2 Peter iii. 16.

tive part treats of the want of righteousness, or the condition of man before and out of Christ. This is the reign of the first, natural, earthly Adam, or the reign of sin and death, appearing partly in unguided Heathenism, partly in the disciplinary institution of legal Judaism; though in the latter case connected with divine promises and significant types and anticipations of the future. The larger, positive section has to do with the Gospel, the absolute religion of liberty and divine sonship,—setting forth the true righteousness as offered in Christ and appropriated by faith. This is the reign of the second, spiritual, heavenly Adam, or of grace and life.¹

This plan is not one arbitrarily forced upon the doctrinal system of the Gentile apostle, but lies clear enough on its surface in his most methodical and systematic epistle, that to the Romans. Here, after the introduction, he first states the essence of Christianity by saying, that “it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. i. 16, 17). This is the theme, the leading thought of the epistle. In unfolding this the apostle first proves, that all men, not only the Gentiles (i. 19–32), but also the Jews (ii. 1–3, 20), are by nature destitute of righteousness, and therefore of salvation and life, and are sinners, worthy of condemnation. Then from chap. iii. 21 onward he shows, that Christ has fulfilled righteousness and procured life and salvation; that these are imparted to us through firm, living faith; that this faith gives the most troubled conscience peace, and must necessarily reveal itself in a holy devoted walk of love and gratitude for the grace received.²

What the apostle of the Gentiles says of himself with primary reference no doubt to the missionary work: “I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me” (1 Cor. xv. 10), is true also in regard to the investigation and development of the Christian doctrine of faith and

¹ Comp. Rom. v. 12, *et seq.* 1 Cor. xv. 45, *et seq.*

² Comp. § 80. We now have several detailed exhibitions of Paul's system of doctrine of various character and value, by Usteri, Dähne, Neander (in the second volume of his *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, etc. p. 654–839) and Baur (in his work on Paul, p. 505–670).

morals. No other apostle has given us so profound and complete an exhibition of the doctrines of sin and grace, of the law and the Gospel, of the eternal conception and the temporal unfolding of the plan of redemption, of the person and work of the Redeemer, of justifying faith and Christian life, of the Holy Ghost, of the church and the means of grace, of the resurrection and the consummation of salvation. In the small compass of his thirteen epistles, Paul has crowded together more genuine spirit, profound thought and true wisdom, than are to be found in the whole mass of the classical or even of the post-apostolical Christian literature. He, who does not see in this an overwhelming proof of the divinity and incomparable glory of Christianity, must have either his heart or his head in the wrong place. Already have eighteen centuries been industriously labouring to expound, digest, and apply in sermons, commentaries and numberless other works, the dogmatic and ethical contents of Paul's system of doctrine, and still it is not exhausted. Where is there a human production in any department of literature, from any age or nation, which has so stirred, fertilized, enlightened, and enlivened human minds, and on which it has been so profitable to think, to speak, to preach, and to write, as, for example, the single epistle to the Romans?

§ 163. *The Writings of Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

Those of the other books of the New Testament, which are allied to the Pauline type of doctrine, are the third gospel, the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistle to the Hebrews.

That *Luke* wrote under the influence of Paul, whom he followed as a faithful disciple and fellow-labourer, has long been acknowledged,¹ and has already been remarked in a former part of this work.² This influence is not to be conceived as in any way affecting the fair representation of the historical facts. The very appearance, the evident fidelity and objectivity, of the books in question, as well as their many Jewish-Christian elements, contradict such a supposition. Paul's influence is to be seen in the general object of the books, and in their author's selection of

¹ Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and other fathers, were of this opinion. See the passages in Credner's *Einleitung in's N. T.* Part I. § 60 and 61.

² Comp. above § 147 and 149.

several traits and incidents not given in the first two gospels, best suiting the free evangelical and universal views of the Gentile apostle, and forming the historical basis for his system of doctrine. Among these Pauline features are the carrying of the genealogy of Jesus back to Adam, the common progenitor of all men, nay, in fact to God, the original ground of all being (Luke iii. 38), while Matthew traces it simply to Abraham, the patriarch of the Jews;¹ the respectful mention of the Samaritans, who were so abhorred by the Jews (ix. 52; x. 30, *et seq.*; xvii. 11, *et seq.*); the account of the mission of the seventy disciples (x. 1–24), who evidently bore the same relation to the heathen world as the twelve disciples to the twelve tribes of Israel;² the parable of the prodigal son, who, in his vagrancy, misery, penitence, and return to his father's house, presents a most graphic picture of Heathenism in contrast with Judaism represented by the elder brother (xv. 11–32); the parable of the Pharisee and Publican, which so unequivocally sets forth Paul's doctrine of justification in opposition to Pharisaical self-righteousness (xviii. 9–14; comp. also xvii. 10); Luke's predilection, in general, for depicting the condescending mercy of the Saviour towards gross, but penitent and anxious sinners (vii. 36–50; xix. 2–10; xxiii. 40–43); finally, the close agreement between Luke's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (xxii. 19, 20) and the statement of Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23–25).

Over the origin and author of the anonymous *epistle to the Hebrews* there hangs a mysterious veil. The book might be compared to the Melchisedec of the profound allegory in its seventh chapter. For, like this personage, it bears itself with priestly and kingly dignity and majesty, but is "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life." Properly and strictly the production of Paul, as the ancient Greek church generally considered it, it can hardly be. Against such a view of it are, the absence of the superscription or

¹ On which Luther makes the striking remark (in his Notes on Matth. i. *Werke*, VII. 10): "Luke, however, goes further and seeks, as it were, to make Christ common to all nations, wherefore he traces His pedigree up to Adam," etc. So already Chrysostom; see Credner, l. c. p. 143.

² Schwegler, *Das nachapost. Zeitalter* II. p. 46: "The twelve are the missionaries of the Messiah to His own people; the seventy, of the Redeemer of the world to all nations."

address, which is lacking in no other epistle of Paul; the passage, chap. ii. 3, which betrays the hand of a *disciple* of the apostles; the highly rhetorical and purely Grecian style, the rhythmical, melodious flow of the language; the close adherence to the Greek translation of the Old Testament, without any corrective reference to the original Hebrew, to which Paul so often pays regard; the place of the book in the canon, after the Pastoral Epistles; and finally, the tradition of the Roman and Latin church, which, according to the express testimony of Jerome, regarded it for a long time, until the council of Hippo (A.D. 393), as not the work of Paul; and the opinion of the learned Alexandrian fathers, who ascribed the substance of the epistle to Paul, but the editing of it, or its translation from the supposed Hebrew original, to one of his disciples, generally Luke or Clement of Rome.¹

On the other hand, however, this epistle bears so striking an affinity to Paul's system of doctrine, and is so uncommonly profound and rich, that one can scarcely help attributing to the apostle of the Gentiles at least a partial or indirect influence on its composition. This most naturally accounts for and reconciles the contradiction in the old church tradition, though, of course, in the absence of definite internal and reliable external evidence, the degree and mode of this influence cannot be accurately determined. If now we attempt to select from among the disciples of Paul the one, who may be regarded with the greatest probability as the immediate author, or at least editor or translator of this Pauline and yet non-Pauline epistle, the choice seems to us

¹ On this whole matter we refer particularly to the uncommonly thorough investigations of Bleek in the first part of his *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, ch. 4, p. 82-430; to the introduction of Tholuck's Commentary (§ 1-4 of the 2d ed.); and to the able treatise of Wieseler in the Appendix to his *Chronologie der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 479-520, with whom, however, we cannot agree at all in supposing the readers of the epistle to have been *Alexandrian* Jews. It was no doubt mainly addressed to the Jewish Christians in Palestine, as the very name Hebrews indicates. Even the modern scholars, who advocate the Pauline origin of the epistle, cannot deny the differences above glanced at, and find it necessary, therefore, somehow to modify their view. Thus Hug, in the third edition of his *Einl. in's N. T.* II. p. 492, ascribes at least the verbal form to Luke; Thiersch regards the epistle as the joint production of Paul and Barnabas (*De epist. ad Hebraeos commentatio historica*, Marburgi, 1848), Delitzsch (in Rudelbach and Guericke's "*Zeitschrift*," 1849, No. 2; translated in the "*Evang. Review*," Oct. 1850, p. 184, *et seq.*), supposes that Paul furnished the main ideas, and Luke wrought them up independently, yet so that Paul could acknowledge it as his own work. Similar is the view of Ebrard in his *Commentar über den Hebräerbrief* (1850), p. 458, *et seq.* (Translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.)

to lie only between Luke and Barnabas. But in the case of each of these so much can be said on both sides, that it is extremely difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to decide.¹ At all events, thus much is settled, that the epistle originated from the school of Paul, is full of his grand ideas, sprang from the living fountain of primitive apostolical Christianity, and, as it takes for granted the continued existence of the temple worship (ix. 6-9), was written before the destruction of Jerusalem—we suppose in Italy, A.D. 63, during the imprisonment of Paul in Rome.

The Pauline stamp of the epistle to the Hebrews is clearly discernible in its whole matter and design. The design of the book is to demonstrate the infinite exaltation of Christ above Moses, Aaron, and all angels, as well as the superiority of the new covenant established by Him over the old, and thus to warn the Palestinian Christians, to whom it is addressed, of the danger, in their depressed situation, of relapse into Judaism (comp. vi. 4, *et seq.*; x. 26, *et seq.*), and to incite them to perseverance. The arguments, however, are mostly drawn from the Old Testament itself, which is to the writer a significant symbol and shadow of good things to come,² prefiguring in all its wonderful institutions

¹ Twesten, Ullmann, and especially Wieseler, l. e. p. 504, *et seq.*, following Tertullian, decide for Barnabas. But then we shall unavoidably have to deny to him the so-called epistle of Barnabas, which falls far below that to the Hebrews. Nor does this hypothesis agree well with the statement in Acts xiv. 12, according to which Barnabas was inferior to Paul in oratorical power, while the author of the epistle to the Hebrews exceeds the apostle in the use of language. In favour of Luke's being the author (but with the co-operation of Paul), we have, after all, the most, viz., his constant intimate relation to Paul; the similarity of style (comp., for example, Luke i. 1-4 with Heb. i. 1-3); and tradition—Clement of Alexandria, in the second century, in his Hypotyposes (in Eus. *H. E.* VI. 14), making Paul, indeed, the author of the supposed Hebrew original, but Luke the Greek translator, and thus accounting for the resemblance of style between the Acts and the epistle to the Hebrews. As, however, no trace is to be found of a Hebrew original, we may better conclude, with Origen (in Euseb. VI. 25), that Paul simply furnished the ideas (*νοήματα*) and left the writing them out (*φράσις καὶ σύνθεσις*) to one of his disciples. As to the other hypotheses, the Roman Clement cannot in any case have been the author; for his epistle to the Corinthians copies whole passages from Hebrews, and bears no comparison with it in genius or copiousness of thought. Eminent scholars, as Bleek, Tholuck, and Credner, have decided for Apollos. But this view, first thrown out as a clever idea by Luther, has not the slightest support from tradition. Nor can anything be said for Apollos, that may not just as well be said for Barnabas or Luke, who, besides, are both more prominent in the New Testament, and more nearly related to Paul.

² Σκια τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, x. 1: ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά τῶν ἐπουρανίων, viii. 5; ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ix. 24; παραβολή εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, ix. 9.

the higher glory of Christianity, but at the same time predicting its own dissolution as soon as the antitype and substance should be revealed. True, the epistle implies throughout the existence still of the Jewish economy and the Levitical cultus, but represents them as superannuated and in process of decay,¹ and points to the impending judgment which a few years afterwards destroyed the holy city and the temple. These exceedingly interesting dogmatic expositions are interwoven with the most precious consolations in view of the heavy persecutions from the unbelieving Jews, and with the most earnest and impressive exhortations to steadfastness in the Christian faith. For the more valuable the blessings of the New Covenant in comparison with the Old, the greater are its obligations also, and the heavier the condemnation for ungratefully rejecting it. Like Paul, this "great unknown," in regard to subjective Christianity, lays the chief stress on *faith*; but sets this forth not so much in opposition to the Jewish legal righteousness, as in its prospective reference, as laying hold on the future and invisible, and thus intimately connected with hope and perseverance under suffering. This is observable particularly in the masterly sketches of the Old Testament heroes in faith, those most sacred representatives of the ante-Christian religion, chap. xi. The author here selects such examples as were exactly suited to the then depressed condition of the believing Hebrews, and must, therefore, have appealed to their hearts and consciences with more than ordinary power. There is another difference. While Paul has his eye chiefly upon the relation of the Gospel to the law, the epistle to the Hebrews has reference more to the system of *worship*, and gives us an exceedingly profound analysis of the typical import of the Old Testament sacrificial cultus, and of the priestly office of Christ in its twofold aspect of a sacrifice once offered on the cross and eternally availing, and a perpetual intercession for believers in the heavenly sanctuary (chap. v.—x.)

The predominance of the Christological element makes this hortatory and consolatory treatise, in connection with the later epistles of Paul, a stepping-stone to the Johannean system of doctrine. From the glowing picture of the exaltation and

¹ ὡς παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφαισμοῦ, viii. 13.

majesty of Christ, rising far above the Jewish idea of the Messiah, forming the introduction, and, as it were, the theme of the epistle (Heb. i. 1-4; comp. Col. i. 15-20), it is but a single step to the prologue of the fourth gospel.

§ 164. (3) *The Ideal Type of Doctrine in John.* (Comp. § 99-108, 148, and 151).

John was the beloved disciple and bosom friend of the Lord. Reposing on the breast of the God-man, he became himself, as it were, a second Jesus, so far as is possible for a mortal. He was the tender, susceptible, reflecting, contemplative apostle of love. He accompanied the apostolic Christianity from its cradle through all the stages of its history, first labouring among the Jews, then entering into Paul's labours among the Greeks, surviving all the apostles, and writing last of all. In John, therefore, we should naturally expect the most profound and ideal conception of Christianity. In fact, his writings exhibit the ripe fruit of the whole preceding development of the apostolic theology, and the final resolution of the great antagonism of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. He penetrated into the heart of Christ; and he has revealed the deepest mysteries of eternal love. The doctrinal system of this prophet of the New Testament anticipates the consummation of the kingdom of God, whose struggles and triumphs, down to the new heavens and the new earth, his eagle eye was enabled to behold from that lone island rock between Asia and Europe. Hence his frequent reference to victories, and the overcoming of all ungodly powers.¹ Hence also that mysterious and unspeakably attractive air of love, of harmony, of perfection, of the eternal, sabbath-like repose of the saints, which pervades his gospels, his epistles, and the anthems of his Revelation.

John had not to pass, like Paul, through mighty inward revolutions and struggles of conscience. His religious experience and views unfolded themselves quietly in personal intercourse with the Redeemer, under the mild rays of the humble glory of

¹ John xvi. 33. 1 John ii. 13; v. 4, 5. Comp. the seven apocalyptic epistles where "he that overcometh" occurs seven times, and Rev. xii. 11; xxi. 7. The word "new," too, is a favourite term with John: new name, new song, new heaven, new earth, new Jerusalem, all things new, comp. Rev. ii. 17; iii. 12; xiv. 3; xxi. 2.

the God-man. Hence with him all radiates from the adoring contemplation of the Saviour, and his whole system of faith and morals is, from beginning to end, *Christological*, in distinction from the predominantly anthropological view of James and Paul, which begins with human need, or the conception of law and righteousness.

In this respect he coincides with Peter. But, while the latter dwells mainly upon the historical appearance of the Lord, his connection with the Jewish nation and the Old Testament economy, his official Messianic character, and makes these the great theme of his preaching, John, on the contrary, fixes his eye upon the *person* of Christ, and goes back to his *eternal Godhead*, which forms, as it were, the primal essence of all revelation in history. He opens both his gospel and his first epistle, as is well known, with the personal Word, who was in the beginning, that is, from eternity, with God—who is in fact the revealed God himself, and, at the same time, the principle and medium of all outward revelation, the fountain of all light and life in the physical and moral universe.¹ Then, in a kind of metaphysical genealogy, he comes down through the preparatory stages of revelation in humanity in general, and in Judaism in particular, to the incarnation, which completes God's self-communication for the salvation of men. This historical manifestation of the incarnate Logos he then accompanies through His life of conflict and suffering to His glorification with the glory which, as God, He had with the Father before the world was, and of which He now takes possession as God-man (comp. John xvii. 5). John's point of departure, therefore, is not the relative, temporal, and human, but the absolute, the eternal, the divine; conceived by no means, however, in any abstract sense, as isolated from life, but in indissoluble connection with the historical personality of Jesus Christ, in which the eternal fulness of the Godhead has manifested itself as an objective reality, and from which, as the central sun of the world's history, light and warmth are diffused in every direction. He who has not the Son has not the Father; but he who has the Son has, with and in the Son, the Father also; and, in the believing knowledge of the Son, in the com-

¹ Comp. with this the similar description of Christ in the beginning of the Apocalypse, i. 5-8.

munion of the whole undivided man with Him, consists eternal life.¹

According to John, therefore, the fundamental idea of objective Christianity is *the perfect self-manifestation of the Father in the Son, or the incarnation of the eternal Word for the life of the world*. He expresses this most briefly in the comprehensive sentence: "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John i. 14). "Word," in the prologue of the gospel, as also in 1 John i. 2, and Rev. xix. 13, is evidently to be taken in the hypostatic sense, as denoting the divine nature of Christ in its relation to God the Father.² For as word is the necessary and most appropriate form and revelation of thought, as well as the best medium of communication between mind and mind (so that thinking might be called an inward speaking, and speaking an outward thinking); so Christ is the revealed outspoken God, in whom the essence of God himself, in its own nature hidden, recognises itself, and through whom it communicates itself outwardly, so that all revelations, even the creation and preservation of the world, are mediated through Christ.³ His Word, which is itself of divine essence, yet distinct from the Father as a separate divine hypostasis, in the fulness of time "was made flesh," that is, took upon himself the entire human nature, body, soul, and spirit, in its fallen state, yet without sin,⁴ to redeem it, and re-

¹ 1 John v. 10-13, 20. Comp. John xvii. 3; xx. 31.

² The Greek λόγος, it is well known, means reason as much as word, ratio as well as oratio, which are both in fact closely connected; but it must here be taken in the latter sense. We cannot at all agree with those, who derive this expression, or even the ideas of John's prologue, from Philo; if for no other reason, because not the least connection can be shown between John and the Greek-Jewish theology of Alexandria. John's doctrine of the Logos was amply suggested by the Old Testament distinction of a hidden and revealed God (Exod. xxxiii. 20, 23); by the *theologumenon* concerning the divine Wisdom (Job xxviii. 12, *et seq.* Prov. chaps. viii. and ix. Sirach chaps. i. and xxiv. Wisdom vi. 22; chap. ix); especially by the doctrine of the *word* of God דְּבַר יְהוָה, by the LXX. commonly translated ῥῆμα, but twice λόγος *Κυρίου*, Ps. xxxiii. 6; cvii. 20, comp. Sirach xliii. 26), which makes its appearance even in the beginning of Genesis as the medium of the creation and of all the revelations, promises, and commands of God; and finally, by the many expressions of Jesus respecting His pre-existence and His divine nature (Matth. xi. 27. John iii. 31; viii. 58; xvii. 5, etc.)

³ John i. 3. Comp. Col. i. 16. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Heb. i. 2.

⁴ To precisely the same purport is the expression of Paul, Rom. viii. 3, that God sent His Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh" ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. Comp. Heb. ii. 17, 18; v. 15.

concile it for ever with God. This Word also “dwelt,” or literally “pitched his tent, tabernacled, among us;” in which expression John probably alludes to the Old Testament *Shekinah* (comp. ἐσκήνωσεν), the abiding of the glory of God over the ark of the covenant in the tabernacle, a faint type of the eternal abode of the Only Begotten in the tabernacle of human nature, full of glory, grace, and truth. This central idea of the incarnation is with John, of course, not simply a speculative truth, but of the deepest practical import. He looks upon the sending of the Son into the world as at the same time the highest act of love, or of God’s free impartation of himself to the reasonable, susceptible creature. He has expressed the inmost nature of God in the words, “God is love” (1 John iv. 8, 16), immediately adding, “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him.”

In accordance with this view, subjective Christianity consists in the *vital union of the believer with God in Christ*, or the thankful reciprocal love of the redeemed towards the Redeemer. This is stated in the form of an exhortation to a moral duty—“Let us love Him, because He hath first loved us” (1 John iv. 19). This forms the highest expression, not only of individual piety, but also of social religion; the inmost and permanent essence of the church, which is seldom mentioned by name in John (3 John 6, 9, 10), but in substance very frequently appears as an organic communion of life and love between the redeemed and the Redeemer, and of the saints with one another—as a *communio sanctorum*, therefore, grounded in the *unio mystica*, which last is rooted, again, in the objective love of God towards us. “If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another” (1 John iv. 11).¹

It is easy to see, that with this apostle all centres ultimately in love. This is the life-blood of his system of faith and morals, and it entered his own soul from the bosom of the Redeemer himself. In fact, that holy name most aptly describes the heart

¹ The Johannean system of doctrine has been treated more at large, though by no means to exhaustion and full satisfaction, by Neander (*Apost. Gesch.* II. p. 874-914), Frommann (*Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff*, Leipzig, 1839), and Köstlin, of Baur’s school (*Der Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der Briefe Joh.* Berlin, 1843.)

of God, and reveals the deepest meaning of all His works and ways. The creation is the act of love, laying the foundation for its future manifestations. The law and promise are the revelation of a love, which would draw men to Christ. The incarnation is the personal manifestation of redeeming love in intimate, indissoluble union with our nature. So, on our part, love to God and man is the sum of all duty and virtue. Does it not lie at the bottom of all the apostles' exhortations? Is it not the mysterious bond by which the representatives of apostolical Christianity, in spite of all their diversity of talent, education, and mode of thought, are bound in inseparable unity? James, indeed, makes Christianity chiefly law and obedience; but he makes love the queen of the law. Peter, the apostle of promise and hope, is most beautiful and lovely in his enthusiastic devotion to Christ and His flock. Paul, the apostle of righteousness and faith, still calls love the bond of perfectness, the most precious of all spiritual gifts, the greatest in that triplet of cardinal Christian virtues; because, being the highest form of union with the Godhead, it never ceases; while tongues and prophecy fail, faith is exchanged for sight, and hope for fruition. In John, the apostle of incarnation and love, this virtue meets us in the deepest and tenderest form; as in his life, from the time he first lay on Jesus' bosom to that last touching exhortation to his little children in his extreme old age—so also in his writings, the whole design of which is to lift the veil from the mystery of eternal love, and draw all his susceptible readers into the same holy and happy fellowship of life with the divine Redeemer.

John's theology is by no means so complete, or developed with such logical precision and argumentative ability as that of Paul. It is sketched from immediate intuition, in extremely simple, artless, childlike form, in grand outlines, in few but colossal ideas and antitheses, such as light and darkness, truth and falsehood, spirit and flesh, love and hatred, life and death, Christ and Anti-christ, children of God and children of the world. But John usually leaves us to imagine far more than his words directly express—an infinity lying behind, which we can better apprehend by faith than grasp and fully measure with the understanding. And especially does he connect everything with that idea of a theanthropic Redeemer, which had become part and parcel

of his own soul; nor can he strongly and frequently enough assert the reality and glory of that, which was to him, of all facts and experiences, the surest, the holiest, and the dearest.¹ But with regard to its principle and the point of view from which it is constructed, the doctrinal system of John is the highest and most ideal of all, the one towards which the others lead and in which they merge. It wonderfully combines mystic knowledge and love, contemplation and adoration, the profound wisdom and childlike simplicity, and is an anticipation, as it were, of that vision face to face, into which, according to Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 12; comp. 2 Cor. v. 7), our fragmentary knowledge, and faith itself, will finally pass.

¹ Comp. the excellent remarks of Neander in his practical Commentary on the first epistle of John (1851), p. 27.

CHAPTER III.

HERETICAL TENDENCIES.

§ 165. *Idea and Import of Heresy.*

THE apostolic period displays not only an unusual degree of spiritual enlightenment and knowledge, which makes it the rule and measure of the whole succeeding theological development of the church, but also extraordinary energy on the part of the spirit of error and the mystery of iniquity. It exhibits a series of dangerous aberrations in theory and practice, which, though in very different forms, at all times threaten the church. So were even the divinely wrought miracles of Moses met by the juggleries of the Egyptian magicians. So in the Gospel narratives there appear a great number of demoniacal possessions; nay, all the powers of darkness were leagued against Him, who had come to destroy the works of the devil. One side of an antagonism always calls out the other. Wherever the seed of the Gospel springs up, the evil one sows tares, and "where God builds a church, Satan builds a chapel by its side." The more mightily the spirit of truth rises, the busier is the spirit of falsehood to contest the ground. Says our Lord—"It *must needs be* that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh" (Matth. xviii. 7; comp. Luke xvii. 1). So Paul, much as he laments the divisions in the church, regards their rise as unavoidable, "that they which are approved may be made manifest" (1 Cor. xi. 19). Of course this necessity is not absolute; for then all distinction between good and evil, truth and falsehood, would at last vanish. It is a relative necessity, founded in the present condition of humanity since the fall. Being what it is, humanity can develop itself only through conflict. As holiness and the knowledge of truth gradually increase, sin and error

also assume more and more dangerous and hateful forms; each successive manifestation being both the fruit and the punishment—as in the case of the opposite process it is the reward—of the preceding. Sin and error generally go together, though in particular cases there are errors not immediately the result of sin, just as there are innocent sufferings and undeserved misfortunes. Error is theoretical sin; sin is practical error. The perversity of the heart is followed by the darkening of the understanding, and vice versa.

The term *heresy* signifies primarily choice, then party, sect. It is commonly used in the bad sense, implying wilfulness on the side of the individual, a spirit of arrogant innovation and party zeal in deviating from public opinion and historical tradition. Ecclesiastical usage has gradually limited it to the sphere of theory, to doctrine, so that heresy has come to mean a wilful corruption of the truth, an erroneous view either of Christianity as a whole or of a single dogma.¹ Near akin to it is the idea of *schism* or church division, which, however, primarily means a separation from the government and discipline of the church, and does not necessarily include departure from her orthodoxy, though, at least when pursued very far, it easily leads to this.²

¹ In the N. T. the term heresy, αἵρεσις, frequently occurs, and in various connections, but almost always involving some bad sense. It is used (1) of the religious parties among the Jews, as the Sadducees (Acts v. 17), the Pharisees (xv. 5; xxvi. 5). (2) Of the Christians in general, who were for a long time called by the Jews in contempt “the sect of the Nazarenes,” ἡ τῶν Ναζωραίων αἵρεσις (Acts xxiv. 5, 14; xxviii. 22). (3) Of parties within the Christian church (1 Cor. xi. 19: δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι. Gal. v. 20). In the same sense Paul several times uses the term σχίσματα, divisions (1 Cor. i. 10; xi. 18; xii. 25). (4) Of heresies proper, or errors, that is, wilful perversions of Christian truth (2 Peter ii. 1: ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεξάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας. Comp. Titus iii. 10, where αἰρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος denotes a heretic, who either founds a new sect under the Christian name, or belongs to one). There is the same reference to heretical demonstrations in the expressions γνώσις ψευδώνυμος, 1 Tim. vi. 20 (in antithesis with διδασκαλία ὑγιαίνουσα, 1 Tim. i. 10; vi. 3. 2 Tim. i. 13; iv. 3. Titus i. 9; ii. 1, also called ἡ κατ’ ἐνσέβειαν διδασκαλία, 1 Tim. vi. 3); ψευδαπόστολοι, 2 Cor. xi. 13; ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, 2 Peter ii. 1; and ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 3.

² Thus the Ebionites, Gnostics, and Arians were heretics; the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists, schismatics. By the standard of the Roman church, the Greek church is only schismatic, the Protestant both heretical and schismatic. With us Protestants schism has in a great measure lost its meaning, especially in this country, where sectarianism is so fully developed. Many consider it no sin whatever, to create division, and to start a new church on the most trifling considerations. Yet schism is as certainly a sin, as the “keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,” so solemnly enjoined by the apostle (Eph. i. 3), is a sacred duty of the

Of course in different branches of the church, especially in her present distracted condition, there are different views of heresy and truth, heterodoxy and orthodoxy, and likewise of schism and sect. Much that Roman Catholics, for example, hold to be orthodox, Protestants reject as heterodox; and *vice versa*. Yet there are certain radical perversions of the Christian faith, certain fundamental heresies, which have been always condemned by the church; and here belong particularly those leading heresies of antiquity, Ebionism and Gnosticism, whose precursors are combated even in the New Testament.

Heresies, like sin, all spring from the natural man; but they first make their appearance in opposition to the revealed truth, and thus presuppose its existence, as the fall of Adam implies a previous state of innocence. There are religious errors, indeed, to any extent out of Christianity, but no heresies in the theological sense. These errors become heresies only when they come into contact, at least outwardly, with revealed truth and with the life of the church. They consist essentially in the conscious or unconscious reaction of unsubdued Judaism or Heathenism against the new creation of the Gospel. Heresy is the distortion or caricature of the original Christian truth.¹ But as God in his wonderful wisdom can bring good out of all evil, and has more than compensated for the loss of the first Adam by the resurrection of the second; so must all heresies in the end only condemn themselves and serve the more fully to establish the truth. The

followers of Christ, who wishes them all to be one, even as He is with the Father (John xvii. 21).

¹ This view, that truth is always older than the corresponding heresy, is grounded in the nature of the case (the original always going before the adulteration or caricature), and was clearly brought out already by Tertullian in many passages. Thus he says, *De praescr. haer.* c. 29: "Sed enim in omnibus veritas imaginem antecedit, post rem similitudo succedit." According to the reverse, pantheistic view of history taken by the modern Tübingen school of Baur, Strauss, Schwegeler, Zeller, etc., orthodoxy, on the contrary, proceeds from heresy, truth from falsehood, and good from evil. The most consistent development of this principle is the ingenious theological romance of Dr Schwegeler, entitled "Das nachapostolische Zeitalter," which would make the Christianity of the church a product of Ebionism in its conflict with Gnosticism. This same philosophy of history—pardon the allusion!—Goethe puts very properly into the mouth of Mephistopheles, who thus characterizes himself:

"Ich bin ein Theil des Theils, der Anfangs Alles war,
Ein Theil der Finsterniss, die sich das Licht gebär,
Das stolze Licht das nun der Mutter Nacht
Den alten Rang, den Raum ihr streitig macht."

New Testament Scriptures themselves are in a great measure the result of a firm resistance to the distortions and corruptions, to which the Christian religion was exposed from the first. Nay, we may say, that every dogma of the church, every doctrine fixed by her symbols, is a victory over a corresponding error, and in a certain sense owes to the error, not indeed its substance, which comes from God, but assuredly its logical completeness and scientific form.¹

Heresies, therefore, belong to the process, by which the Christian truth, received in simple faith, becomes clearly defined as an object of knowledge. They are the negative occasions, the challenges, for the church to defend her views of truth, and to set them forth in complete, scientific form.

§ 166. *Classification and General Character of the Heresies.*

The proper division of the heresies of the first period is suggested by our classification of the doctrinal systems of the apostles; for the former precisely correspond to the latter, as their respective excesses and caricatures. As the church fell into the two sections of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, different indeed, but consistent, bound together in love, and each the complement of the other; and as these after the destruction of Jerusalem grew together in a higher, organic unity, represented by John;² so we shall have, in the first place, to distinguish two leading heretical tendencies, of which the first proceeded from Judaism, the second from Heathenism, so adulterating the Gospel with one or the other of those two old systems of religion, that, though Christian in form and name, they were in fact Jewish or heathen. The first tendency is the heretical or ultra and pseudo-Jacobite and pseudo-Petrine Jewish Christianity, or the *Judaizing*³ and *legalistic* tendency, which in the second century sepa-

¹ So to the Rationalists and the above-named Hegelian Gnostics we cannot deny the merit of having involuntarily done essential service to the believing theology of the present, as their forerunners in the early church did to the patristic literature.

² Comp. above, § 156.

³ The expressions *Judaistic* and *Judaizing*, are not to be confounded, therefore, with *Jewish-Christian*. The latter primarily denotes simply national origin and character, and refers to Judaism in its purity as a divine revelation leading to Christ. The others always include the idea of an impure combination of the human and degenerate Jewish principle with the Christian. Comp. also Schliemann: *Die Clementinen*, etc., p. 371, *et seq.* Note.

rated completely from the catholic church under the name of Ebionism. The second is the heretical or ultra and pseudo-Pauline Gentile Christianity, containing the germs of *Gnosticism* and *Antinomianism*, which in the latter part of the apostolic period were already very powerfully and dangerously at work, although they did not appear in fully developed form till the time of Adrian. Then they came out in a succession of schools and systems widely differing again among themselves, according to the nature and extent of the heathen element and its relation to the two other religions. As, however, there arose combinations of Jewish and pagan ideas, particularly in the sect of the Essenes and Judæo-Platonic philosophy of Philo,¹ so might these two opposite systems coalesce in some confused way under the Christian name and Christian forms of expression. This syncretistic heresy, which forms in some sense the satanic caricature of the true reconciliation of Jewish and Gentile Christianity in John's doctrinal system, may be called, according as one or the other element predominates, Gnosticizing Judaism or Judaizing Gnosticism. The Gnostic appearances in the New Testament are mostly of this mixed sort.

In the time of Paul controversy turned chiefly on the relation between the law and the Gospel. Here men might err in two directions. The Gospel might either be made a new law of bondage, or abused to the indulgence of the flesh. The first error was Pharisaical, the second pagan. Between legalism and antinomianism lies the ascetic contempt of the body, seen in the Colossian errorists. But the question of the import of the law necessarily involved the other—"What think ye of Christ?" In process of time the conflict between Christian truth and anti-christian falsehood came more and more to centre in Christology, and reached its height in the age of St John. This apostle strikes the deepest root of the heresy, when he gives as its distinctive mark the denial of the appearance of the Son of God in the flesh, or of the absolute reconciliation of the divine and human in Christ, and hence calls it "*antichrist*" (1 John ii. 22; iv. 1-3. 2 John 7). He here has primarily in his eye, no doubt, the Gnostic view of the person of Christ, which denied,

¹ Comp. § 50 and 51.

directly or indirectly, the reality of the Lord's human nature, and became very prevalent even during the lifetime of the apostle. But the same criterion may be applied also to the other heresies. The mystery of the incarnation may be annulled in three ways: (1) by denying the *divine* nature of Jesus Christ, (2) by denying his *human* nature, (3) by holding a merely *transient* union of a common Jew, Jesus, with the heavenly Messiah (in the baptism in Jordan) and a subsequent separation of the two (at the beginning of the passion). In the first case the heresy is Ebionism; in the second, proper Docetism and heathen Gnosticism; in the third, which unites the errors of the other two, we have what is supposed to have been the view of Cerinthus, a later contemporary of John. In all, the foundation of the church is undermined. For if Christ is not the God-man, in the full sense of the term, and that permanently, He is not the mediator and reconciler between God and man. Our hope is gone. All Christianity sinks back either into Judaism or Heathenism. It is easy to see how all partial heresies, which have since made their appearance in church history, stand connected more or less closely with one of these primary forms, and with the question—"What think ye of Christ?" The correct and complete solution of the Christological question is accordingly the best refutation of all errors of faith.

§ 167. *Judaistic Heresies. Pharisaic or Legalistic Judaism.*

According to the design of its divine founder, and in the inmost tendency of its nature, Judaism was a positive and direct preparation for Christianity, destined to resolve itself into the latter, as the morning twilight into the perfect day, or the bud into the fruit.¹ But under the influence of human depravity, it for the most part either took the attitude of full hostility to the Gospel, crucifying Christ, persecuting His apostles, and thrusting them out of the synagogues; or came into mere external association with the Christian religion, and corrupted it with Jewish leaven. This nominally Christian Judaism, which had been baptized only with water, not with the Holy Ghost and with fire, was the first error which made its appearance in the Chris-

¹ Comp. § 47.

tian church. It showed itself particularly in opposition to Paul, the liberal apostle of the Gentiles; and though amply refuted by him it is continually re-appearing, as well as the opposite errors of heathen origin, in variously modified forms. To this day man is in his nature predominantly Jewish or predominantly heathen; and, so long as the church is militant, this nature will react against the revelation and the grace of God.¹

As Judaism was at that time divided into three different sects,² we should expect also three corresponding forms of perverted Christianity: (1) the Pharisaic, or rigidly legal heresy; (2) the Sadducistic, or lax and frivolous (theoretically sceptical or rationalistic, and practically materialistic); (3) the Essenic, or theosophic, mystico-speculative, and ascetic, with more or less admixture of heathenism. These three degenerate forms of Judaism and Jewish Christianity would then correspond to the Stoic, the Epicurean, and the Platonic tendencies in the heathen world. The first and third forms meet us very often in the New Testament, and appear more systematically developed in the Ebionism of the second century (from the reign of Adrian onward), which was likewise divided into the practical Pharisaic and the speculative Gnostic branches. The Jewish Sadducism had, indeed, like the Grecian Epicureanism, too little moral and religious earnestness to take any deep and general interest in Christianity. Yet a way of thinking corresponding to this also we find in the church in the form of unbridled antinomianism; which, however, sprang not so much from Sadducism as from gross misconception of Paul's doctrine, and arose upon Gentile-Grecian soil.

We take up first the *Pharisaico-Judaistic* tendency, or the stiff legalism in the apostolic church. This, as we see from Acts xv. 1, 5, first showed itself clearly in the church of Jerusalem in the year 50, and gave the immediate occasion for the apostolic council. It held, indeed, that the Messiah appeared in Jesus of Nazareth. But this was the only thing which distinguished it

¹ We may say in general, that Catholicism is exposed to the temptations and dangers of legal Judaism; Protestantism to those of licentious heathenism. Yet on both sides are found, as even in the apostolic period, combinations of these opposite errors.

² Comp. § 49.

from the proper Pharisaism; and even in its notion of the Messiah it was most probably as firmly bound as the later Ebionism to the gross and carnal notions of the vulgar Judaism. The well-known peculiarities of the Pharisaic sect, which subsequently took a fixed form in the Talmud,—stiff, bigoted legalism and self-righteousness, pedantic scrupulosity in respect to outward forms and usages,—it transferred to Christianity; adhering particularly to the principle, which after the conversion of Cornelius was expressly condemned by God himself (Acts x.), and also by the apostolic council (chap. xv.), that circumcision and the observance of the whole Jewish ceremonial law was indispensable to salvation, and that, therefore, whoever would be a true Christian, must be at the same time, outwardly and inwardly, a strict Jew. Of the newness, the creative spirit and life, and the universality of Christianity, it never dreamed; but sought to compress the Christian religion within the narrow lines of a Jewish sect. It is true, the Judaists did not come out always with the same boldness, and particularly after the apostolic council some of them, at least in the Greek churches, changed their tactics. But even where they showed themselves somewhat liberal, they still asserted the superiority of the circumcised Christians, insisted on their separating themselves from the uncircumcised Gentile Christians (Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*), and considered the latter scarcely better than proselytes of the gate. As all heretics are ready to appeal to the Scriptures (as interpreted by themselves), so these errorists, to gain the greater acceptance referred to the Jewish apostles,—the stricter party to James (Gal. ii. 12), the more moderate to Cephas, who had been placed in so high a position by the Lord himself. But of course they had no right to make such use of these apostles, who in fact in the year 50 refused to put upon the Gentile Christians the burden of the ceremonial law, owned them as brethren without their being circumcised, and fully agreed with Paul in the maxim, that no human work, but only the grace of Jesus Christ and living faith in Him can save.¹

Another characteristic of the Pharisaic Judaizers was an inexorable hatred of Paul. They regarded him not as a legitimate

¹ Acts xv. Gal. ii. 1 Peter v. 12. 2 Peter iii. 15.

apostle at all, but as a religious revolutionist, who unsparingly trampled under foot the sacred traditions of the Mosaic religion and the authority of the divine law, introduced the greatest confusion, and turned away the mass of the Jews from Christianity. Hence they everywhere endeavoured, and in some cases not without success, particularly in the Galatian churches, to undermine his authority and influence, to bring his motives under suspicion, and in every way to embitter his life.¹ The epistles to the Galatians and Romans, and the two, especially the second, to the Corinthians, cannot be at all understood historically, without continual reference to this slavish, bigoted legalism and anti-Paulinism, and its malicious machinations.

These Judaistic errorists, or “*false* brethren unawares brought in” (Gal. ii. 4), should by no means be confounded with the “*weak* brethren” (Rom. xiv. 1, *et seq.*; xv. 1, *et seq.*), *i.e.* the Jewish Christians, who for their own part moved, indeed, with scrupulous conscientiousness in the traditional forms of the Mosaic religion, yet at the same time referred all salvation to Christ, and recognised the free Gentile Christians as brethren in the Lord. Towards these Paul, according to his maxim, 1 Cor. xi. 19, was exceedingly indulgent, and, as may be seen from Rom. xiv. and xv., 1 Cor. viii. and ix., his collections for the poor churches in Judea, and his conduct during his last visit in Jerusalem, claimed for them brotherly love and forbearance. But in opposition to the other errorists he—himself once, in Pharisaic blindness and mistaken zeal, a persecutor of the church of Christ—was inflexible; for they annulled the proper essence of the Gospel; wished to replace the old yoke of legal bondage and pupillary religion; spread division everywhere in his churches,

¹ The later Ebionites also had an unconquerable hatred of the apostle of the Gentiles, and condemned all his epistles as heretical, while they extolled James and Peter to the skies. According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* I. 2, § 26), they circulated respecting Paul the ridiculous lie, that he was originally a heathen of Tarsus, then passed over to Judaism at Jerusalem from love to a daughter of the high priest, but apostatized again in consequence of disappointment in the desired marriage, and out of spite wrote against circumcision and the Sabbath. The Pseudoclementine Homilies (comp. particularly *Hom.* XVII. c. 19 with Gal. ii. 9-11) represent him, under the figure of Simon Magus, as a seducer, and the patriarch of all heretics. The anti-Jewish Gnostics, on the contrary, hated the elder Jewish apostles, condemned their writings, and appealed all the more zealously to Paul, whom, however, they of course completely caricatured.

especially in Galatia and Corinth, and even in Philippi;¹ and in all this sought their own glory far more than Christ's. To this great controversy of the Gentile apostle with the Pharisaic Judaizers we owe the masterly and unfathomably profound exhibitions of the evangelical doctrines of the law and the Gospel, sin and grace, bondage and freedom, faith and justification, which lie before us in his epistles. Through the destruction of Jerusalem and the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles, this Pharisaico-Christian particularism necessarily lost by degrees its significance, at least out of Palestine; and though it perpetuated itself in the second century in Ebionism, yet even in this shape it had nothing like the currency or the influence on the church which the opposite heresy of Gnosticism possessed. But the Judaistic tendency did not seek to maintain itself everywhere on these Pharisaic principles. A part of it, even in the lifetime of Paul, took a more refined, and for earnest philosophically educated Gentiles, more plausible form, to the consideration of which we now pass.

§ 168. *Essenic or Gnostic Judaism.*

The *Essenic Judaizing* tendency, as a heresy in the Christian church, meets us first towards the close of Paul's labours and among the churches of Asia Minor. It is characterized by a mixture of Christian ideas, and a Christian confession with the theosophic or mystico-speculative and the ascetic elements of the Essenes and the kindred Therapeutae, who, according to the explicit testimony of Philo, were widely spread over Egypt.² These sects, whose special object it was to reach a deeper knowledge (Gnosis) and greater moral perfection than was attainable in the common Judaism, soon, of course, felt themselves attracted to Christianity; but, instead of submitting to the gospel in its simplicity, they moulded it to their own taste. This was the origin of that Judaizing Gnosticism, which was more clearly and fully developed in the second century, in the remarkable system of the Pseudoclementine Homilies, and in kindred heretical pro-

¹ That the Judaizers gained foothold also in Philippi has been by many, indeed, denied, but seems clear from Phil. i. 15-18, and iii. 2, *et seq.*, where the apostle even calls them "dogs," and, with sarcastic allusion to their self-righteous and heretical zeal for circumcision, the "concision" (κατατομή).

² Comp. § 49 and 51.

ductions. But as even in Essenism and Therapeutism, and no less in the Platonico-Jewish system of Philo, the influence of heathen religion and speculation, both Oriental and Hellenic (Platonic and Pythagorean), is demonstrable;¹ so with this Christian heresy; and for this reason some scholars distinctly classify it with the heathen or proper Gnosis.² In fact it is hard to say, as also in the case of many of the heretical phenomena of the second century, whether they belong to the strictly Judaizing tendency or to the proper Gnosticism; unless with Schliemann,³ we make the doctrine of the demiurge, or a creator of the world differing from the supreme God, the infallible mark of Gnosticism. Of a demiurge, however, we find no clear traces in the New Testament; even in the obscure passage, 2 Pet. ii. 10 (δόξας οὐ τρέμουνσι βλασφημοῦντες, comp. Jude 8). Yet one may say that the extreme depreciation of matter and body, which we find opposed in Col. ii. 23 and 1 Tim. iv. 3, borders on and logically leads to the notion of the demiurge. Though all the forms of Gnosticism, the Judaizing among the rest, are more or less affected with latent heathen elements, yet it cannot be asserted that speculation is in the nature of the case foreign to Judaism. This is contradicted not only by the later Cabbala, but also by the Old Testament books of Proverbs and Job, and by the apocryphal 'literature in general.' The great matter was, whether the spirit of philosophical and theological inquiry was guided by the spirit of the divine revelation, or took its own course. In the latter case, it certainly always ran more or less into the errors of heathen speculation.

1. Among these Judaizing Gnostics or Essenic Judaists we reckon first the false teachers of *Colosse* in Phrygia, where, as the Montanism (altogether anti-Gnostic however) of the second and third centuries shows, the people were constitutionally inclined to

¹ On the affinity of these Jewish sects with Pythagoreanism, the reader should compare Gfrörer; *Krit. Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, I. 2, p. 352, *et seq.*

² A modern English divine—Stanley—on the contrary, regards all the heretics attacked by Paul, and even those combated by Peter, Jude, and John, as Judaizers. But against this Conybeare and Howson, in their work on St Paul, I. p. 490-492, have entered very well-founded objections. Dr Burton more properly derives the Gnosticism of the Apost. Age from the joint sources of the Jewish Cabbala, the Eastern dualism, and the Platonic philosophy.

³ *Die Clementinen*, p. 539.

religious fanaticism. We become acquainted with these errorists chiefly from details of their system hinted at in the second chapter of the epistle to the Colossians. Paul here combats their view,¹ but much more leniently than the Pharisaic legalism in the Galatian churches, because it was far less developed and less hostile to himself. Their speculative character is plain from Col. ii. 4, where the apostle speaks of their “enticing words” (*πιθανολογία*), and ver. 8, where he warns his readers against their philosophy: “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men (in opposition to the certain, reliable revelation of God), after the rudiments of the world,² and not after Christ.”³ Probably the reference here is to the mystic, symbolical philosophy, which Philo ascribes to the Essenes and Therapeutae.⁴ In contrast with this false wisdom of men, the apostle emphatically represents Christ as the source and sum of all genuine knowledge, wisdom, and spiritual understanding (i. 9 ; ii. 3).

With their mystic philosophy the Colossian errorists set a high value on sacred rites, especially circumcision (to which Paul opposes the spiritual circumcision of Christ, ii. 11), and scrupulously observed the Jewish laws respecting food and yearly, monthly, and weekly feasts,—shadows of the true body, which had appeared in Christ (ii. 16). Here they coincided with the Pharisaical errorists (comp. Gal. iv. 9, 10). But with these Judaistic views and practices they associated a rigid asceticism, a mortification of the body (*ἀφειδία σώματος*, ii. 23), which went beyond anything in Pharisaism or the whole Old Testament, not excepting even the prescriptions for the Nazarite (comp. Num. chap. vi.) This in all probability sprang from a pagan dualistic

¹ Comp. § 86.

² *Τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, comp. ver. 20, and Gal. iv. 3, 9. Most commentators refer this to the Jewish ceremonial law as a pupillary religion designed for spiritual childhood.

³ This passage is frequently, but altogether unjustly, viewed as a condemnation of *all* philosophy. Paul is evidently warning his readers only against a particular kind of philosophy, which, he hints in the words *κενῆς ἀπάτης*, does not merit the name of philosophy at all, but is an inanis fallacia. Calixtus has well observed, against this abuse of the passage: “Si dicam, vide ne decipiat vinum, nec vinum damno, nec usum ejus accuso, sed de vitando abusu monco.”

⁴ The *φιλοσοφία διὰ συμβόλων*. Perhaps the Colossian errorists already, as afterwards the Oriental anchorites and monks, designated their whole mode of life *φιλοσοφία* and *φιλόσοφος βίος*, an anticipation of the *vita angelica*.

view of the world, which made matter and body in themselves evil, and redemption a gradual destruction of the bodily nature. The conception of the body as the work of the devil we find in all the Gnostic and Manichean sects. The Scriptures, on the contrary, make the clearest distinction between body and flesh, representing the former as the work of God, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, but the latter as the perversion of a nature in itself originally good, as the selfish, sinful principle. Finally, these Colossian errorists practiced under the garb of humility the worship of angels (*θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων*, ii. 18), soaring into transcendental regions, and probably pretending to be conversant, through visions, with the mysteries of the upper world of spirits,¹ instead of holding to Christ, the Creator of angels, the revealed Head of the church, and communing with God through Him. To many commentators this passage, indeed, suggests the Gnostic aeons; but it seems more naturally to refer to the “thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers” of the later Jewish angelology (i. 16).² To the necessity of meeting this error we owe some of Paul’s profoundest disclosures respecting Christ’s person and relation to the church.

2. Under the head of this Gnosticizing Judaism belong also the errorists of the *Pastoral* Epistles. Yet the Essenic origin of these cannot be so easily shown, nor, consequently, the line so sharply drawn between them and the heathen Gnostics. Hence they may be called with about equal propriety Judaizing Gnostics or Gnostic Judaizers. It was one great object of the *Pastoral* Epistles to warn Timothy and Titus of the commencement and canker-like spread of apostacy from the pure apostolic tradition or from the “sound doctrine.”³ These heretics must be

¹ In Col. ii. 18 there is a remarkable difference of readings. The *textus receptus* reads: *ἃ μὴ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων*, while Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the best critical authorities, omit the *μή*. Either reading, however, gives a good sense, as we have indicated in the text.

² In support of this interpretation are the facts, that still later the 35th canon of the Laodicean council forbids the invocation of angels; that there was still standing in the middle ages in Chonae (Colosse) a temple of the archangel Michael; and other facts adduced by Wetstein, Steiger (*Comment. zum Kol. br.* p. 31), and Thiersch (*Versuch zur Herstellung*, etc. p. 272). Among the Essenes, according to Josephus sacred names of the angels were revealed to the initiated (*De bell. Jud.* II. 8, § 7. Comp. the note on this by the English translator, Whiston, vol. ii. p. 249, Philad. ed.)

³ *Ἐγχειρίδιον διδασκαλίας*, 1 Tim. i. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 3. Titus i. 9; ii. 1.

looked for particularly in Ephesus and its vicinity. For here Timothy was residing;¹ here was a rendezvous of heathen and Jewish superstition and magic;² here, according to Paul's prophecy in his valedictory at Miletus, A.D. 58, were to rise after his departure "grievous wolves" from among the Ephesian presbyters themselves;³ finally, the epistle to the Ephesians also, A.D. 62 or 63, opposes, not indeed openly and directly, but assuredly indirectly, by the positive development of truth, a Gnostic error similar to that attacked in the very closely allied epistle to the Colossians, and contrasts with its vain mock wisdom the true saving knowledge of Christ and His church. We have every reason, therefore, to place the rise of this Judaizing Gnosis at the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh decade of the first century. From the epistle in the Apocalypse to the angel of the church of Ephesus (ii. 2, 6) it appears, that this congregation at the end of the first century firmly withstood the errorists, indeed, but in its zeal for orthodoxy neglected practical Christianity, the active duties of love.

In examining the passages of the Pastoral Epistles, which are concerned with heresies,⁴ we derive great assistance from com-

¹ 1 Tim. i. 3. 2 Tim. i. 15, 18; iv. 19.

² Acts xix. 13, *et seq.* Comp. § 76.

³ Acts xx. 29, 30. We have on a former occasion observed, that this passage is not inconsistent with the earlier presence of errors in the *congregation*, as in fact it speaks particularly of heretical *presbyters* (comp. ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν); and that it cannot, therefore, be used as evidence of a later date of the first epistle to Timothy; the less, since this epistle itself, and even the still later second epistle to Timothy, represent some of the errors as yet in the future.

⁴ These are: Titus i. 9-16; iii. 9-11. 1 Tim. i. 3, 4, 6, 7, 19, 20; iv. 1-8; vi. 3-5, 20, 21. 2 Tim. ii. 16-18, 23; iii. 1-9, 13; iv. 3, 4. Besides these, there may be a few passages indirectly opposing errors, though Baur has unquestionably sought far too many such allusions. Most investigators of this intricate subject suppose that Paul, in these epistles, contends everywhere against substantially the same unsound tendency; and this is certainly supported by the similarity of the expressions in the various passages, as ματαιλογία, μῦθοι γενεαλογίαι, etc. Thiersch, on the contrary, in his book on the criticism of the N. T. Scriptures, p. 236, *et seq.* and 274, proposes to distinguish *three* kinds of errorists in the Pastoral Epistles: (1) Common Judaizers, who were, properly speaking, not so much heretical as obstinate and morally perverse, in the ep. to Titus, and in 1 Tim. i. 7; (2) Some few spiritualistic Gnostics, like Hymeneus and Philetus, who had "made shipwreck concerning faith," and were excommunicated by the apostle,—followers of the ψευδῶνυμος γνώσις, 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; vi. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 16-18, 25; (3) Goëtae, who are compared to the Egyptian magicians, 2 Tim. iii. 1-9. But this classification certainly cannot be applied throughout, and introduces confusion rather than clearness in the exposition. We may remark in

paring these errors with the subsequent kindred phenomena of the second century. Yet we should not identify them with these later heresies, as Baur, to make out his case against the genuineness of these epistles, has done. We may very naturally, and we must necessarily, suppose, that the Gnostic ideas were on their first appearance very indefinite, crude, and chaotic. They form the necessary links, which connect the ante-Christian Judaism and Heathenism with the fully developed heretical systems, which meets us from the reign of Adrian onward. Paul himself more than once says, that, according to the prophetic testimony of the Holy Ghost, the dangerous errors, against which he so earnestly warns his disciples, were further to develop and diffuse themselves in future.¹

The system attacked in the Pastoral Epistles is explicitly characterized in 1 Tim. vi. 20 as *Gnosis*, i.e. higher knowledge, which all the later Gnostics fancied they possessed, and from which they therefore named themselves. But Paul speaks of it at the same time as "*falsely so called*" (*ψευδώνυμος γνώσις*), not properly meriting the name of knowledge at all, resting on mere arrogant conceit,² and running out into unprofitable subtleties

general, that many assertions of the otherwise highly valuable treatise on the New Testament heresies in the above work of Thiersch are exaggerated and untenable.

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1. 2 Tim. iii. 1; iv. 3. Comp. Acts xx. 29, *et seq.* So also the historian, Hegesippus, of the middle of the second century, says, according to the rather summary statement of Eusebius, III. 32, that the *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις* did not show itself with uncovered head (*γυμνή λοιπόν ἤδη τῇ κεφαλῇ*) and mar the virginal purity of the church till after the death of the apostles, but previously wrought in secret (*ἐν ἀδύλῳ του σκότει*). Baur, in the "Tübinger Zeitschrift," 1838, No. 3, p. 27, and in his work on Paul, p. 494 (as well as Schwegler: *Nachapost. Zeitalter*, II. p. 137), has entirely misrepresented this passage by omitting what the author says of the previous *secret working* of the Gnosis, and substituting for the antithesis made by Hegesippus, of an open and concealed existence of the false Gnosis his own antithesis of an existence and non-existence of it. Besides, the same Hegesippus, in Euseb. IV. 22, places the rise of the heresies in the Palestinian church in the period immediately succeeding the death of James, nay, traces some of them back to Simon Magus. The conclusion, therefore, which Baur draws from the testimony in Euseb. III. 32 against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles and the letters of Ignatius, of course falls to the ground. Rather does Hegesippus prove, by the very terms he here uses, *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις*, *ἐτεροδιδάσκαλοι*, *ύγιής κανών*, that he was already acquainted with the first epistle to Timothy. For, that the epistle borrowed the terms from Hegesippus, as Baur asserts, is altogether too preposterous and incredible, in view of the clear and strong testimony of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, etc., in favour of the Pauline origin of the Pastoral Epistles.

² Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 1, where *γνώσις* is used likewise, so as to involve a bad sense: "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth." Comp. the use of *φιλοσοφία*, Col. ii. 8.

and vain babblings.¹ As parts of this false wisdom are cited “old wives’ fables” and “endless genealogies.”² By these we must understand, however, not the successive emanations of the higher spirits, the genealogies of aeons, which appear in the later Gnostic systems,³ but the insipid fables and traditions of the later Jewish secret doctrine respecting the times of the patriarchs and the various orders of angels (comp. Col. ii. 18 ; i. 16), also genealogical investigations, subtle questions of the law, and allegorical interpretations of Biblical narratives.⁴ Such worthless stories are still found, as is well known, in the Talmud and in the Cabbala (תורה—tradition), the elements of which confessedly existed already in the first century, probably even before the destruction of Jerusalem. The correctness of our explanation is clear from several passages. In Titus i. 14 these fables are expressly called “Jewish.” According to ver. 10, these vain talkers and deceivers were chiefly the circumcised (μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς). In iii. 9, in conjunction with genealogies, are placed “contentions and strivings about the law” (ἔρεις καὶ μάχαι νομικαί). Finally, the name “teachers of the law” (νομοδιδάσκαλοι, 1 Tim. i. 7), which these heretics assumed, points to their Judaistic origin, indicating an unevangelical zeal in them for the Mosaic law, especially its ceremonial part—a feature, with which we have already become acquainted as characteristic of the Colossian heretics.⁵

¹ Βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι, 1 Tim. vi. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 16 ; ματαιολογία, 1 Tim. i. 6 ; λογομαχίαι, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί, vi. 4.

² Μύθοι καὶ γενεαλογίαι ἀπέχρυστοι, 1 Tim. i. 4 ; βέβηλοι καὶ γραῶδεις μύθοι, iv. 7. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 4. Titus i. 14 ; iii. 9.

³ As Dr Baur does, in his work on the Pastoral Epistles (1835), p. 12, *et seq.*, where he refers to the pairs or syzygies of aeons emanating from one another, as found in the much later Valentinian system, particularly to the myth of Sophia Achamoth.

⁴ Philo, for example, calls his allegorical explanations of the Mosaic genealogies γενεαλογικόν. Comp. Dähne : “Studien und Kritiken,” 1833, p. 1008. So also Thiersch (l. c. p. 274), Wiesinger (in his continuation of Olshausen’s *Comment.* V. p. 215), and Burton (*Lectures*, p. 114), understand the “genealogies” here in the proper Jewish sense—which is certainly much more natural than to refer them to the successive orders of aeons in the later Gnosticism. Dr Burton, the most important English authority on the Gnostic heresies, endeavours, by the way, to show (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 304-306), that the Gnostic theories of the aeons and their emanations were in part derived from Jewish sources. The Cabbala, for example, teaches of ten *Sephiroth*, or emanations from God. At all events, however, the Platonic philosophy and the Oriental systems of religion must be regarded also as sources of Gnosticism.

⁵ Baur, on the contrary, l. c. p. 15, *et seq.*, altogether unnaturally takes these “teachers of the law,” who themselves wished to be considered such (θέλοντες εἶναι), to have been just the opposite—*antinomians* of the school of Marcion ; and makes the

With this self-conceited, subtle, and barren mock wisdom the Ephesian false teachers, like those at Colosse, seem to have united an ascetic mode of life, which went far beyond the Old Testament restrictions respecting food, and was probably connected with a hylozoistic and dualistic view of the world, and an aversion to God's creation. At least the apostle, 1 Tim. iv. 3, predicts that there should soon appear such extravagances, as we actually find afterwards in the Gnostic (Marcionite among the rest) and Manichean systems,—the prohibition of marriage and of certain kinds of food (probably animal) which God had created to be eaten with thanksgiving.¹ He describes such precepts as “doc-

μάχαι νομικαί strivings *against* the law!—which verily reminds one of the derivation of *lucus a non lucendo*. He appeals, indeed, to ver. 8 immediately following: Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι καλὸς ὁ νόμος, εἰάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρῆται, whence it would appear that those heretics set up the opposite principle, that the law was not good. But these words of the apostle are rather to be viewed as a concession, with a limitation added, as is shown even by the concessive οἶδαμεν, and a closer examination of verses 9 and 10. The law is unquestionably good, Paul would say, but not in the sense in which the false teachers assert. And on these and similar exegetical artifices this critic builds the conclusion, that the Pastoral Epistles have in view the Marcionite Gnosis, and, consequently, cannot have been written before the middle of the second century! But this whole theory of Baur respecting the Pastoral Epistles has already been thoroughly refuted by the counter productions of Baumgarten, Böttger, and Thiersch, and by the latest commentaries of Huther and Wiesinger. We only add, that the most plausible part of his argument, his identification of the ἀντιθέσεις, 1 Tim. vi. 20, with the Antitheses Marcionis mentioned by Tertullian, has no support, even in the accidental verbal coincidence—the title of Marcion's work being not Ἀντιθέσεις at all, but Ἀντιπαρεθέσεις. At least so it is designated by Hippolytus in his lately-discovered refutation of heresies. Comp. Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, I. p. 75, of the German edition. At any rate, the ἀντιθέσεις, 1 Tim. vi. 20, are to be understood, not of the contradictions asserted by Marcion between the law and the Gospel, but of the opposition of the errorists to the πάραθήκη, i.e., the pure doctrine, which Timothy was to preserve (comp. 2 Tim. i. 12, 14; iii. 14); so that the sense of the passage is simply this: “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane, vain babblings, and the counter assertions of the knowledge falsely so called.” Comp. Titus i. 9, where these deceivers are described as ἀντιλέγοντες; and 2 Tim. ii. 25, where they are said to be ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι. Comp. Wieseler (*Chronol.* p. 305) and Wiesinger *ad loc.*

¹ The reference of 1 Tim. iv. 3 to the Roman church is altogether inadmissible, and by modern expositors generally abandoned. For this church does not forbid marriage as such, but even exalts it to a sacrament. And of the prohibition of marriage for priests in particular nothing at all is said in the text. No more does the Roman church forbid any kind of food as such, but only requires abstinence and fasting on certain days; which is nothing in itself unchristian, however wrong it may be to prescribe it in such legalistic, Jewish style. Our Lord himself and his apostles sometimes fasted out of their own free will. Comp. Matth. iv. 2; xvii. 21. Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23. 1 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Cor. vi. 5. On the contrary, it is an ascertained fact, that many Gnostics, as Marcion, Saturninus, Tatian, as well as the Manicheans, con-

trines of devils" (διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων, ver. 1); in other words, he attributes them to the suggestion of evil spirits, in antithesis with the suggestion of the Spirit of God mentioned in the beginning of the verse. Man, according to the Scriptural view, is never wholly isolated, but lives continually under either divine or diabolical influences. Hence the errorists are elsewhere called also pseudo-prophets and pseudo-apostles.¹ Such asceticism has, it is true, a deceptive appearance of holiness, but proceeds from a hypocritical disposition and an evil conscience (ver. 2), and might very easily run into the opposite extreme of the most unbridled pagan immorality.

Of the heretics of the Pastoral Epistles two are mentioned by name, Hymeneus and Alexander,² who had made shipwreck with the faith, pursued their errors to a blasphemous length, and were accordingly thrust out by Paul from the communion of the church (1 Tim. i. 20); whereas most of the errorists in view are considered as within the congregations. This has made some suppose two different classes of errorists. The Hymeneus here mentioned is no doubt the same with the one described in 2 Tim. ii. 17, in connection with Philetus, as a denier of the resurrection. This denial probably arose from a false Gnostic spiritualism, and is accordingly to be traced rather to a pagan than to a Sadducean source, though we have, to be sure, no means of accurately determining.

§ 169. *The Heathen Gnosticism and Antinomianism.*

As Christianity spread among the heathen, there could not fail to appear here also the same phenomenon of a merely outward conversion and a subsequent reaction of the old habits of thought and life, which we have observed in the Jewish-Christian portion of the church. And as the Judaizers were ever

demned marriage and sexual intercourse as diabolical, and as contamination with sinful matter; and so the eating of flesh and drinking of wine as such. And even among the Essenes and Therapeutae, too, we find a similar undervaluation of marriage, on the authority of Philo and Josephus (*e. g.* *Antiqu.* XVIII. 1, 5. *De bell. Jud.* II. 8, 2).

¹ Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15. 1 John iv. 1-3. Rev. ii. 20, and the comparison of the false teachers with Balaam, 2 Peter ii. 15. Jude 11. Rev. ii. 14, and with the Egyptian sorcerers, 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9. James also, iii. 15, speaks of a σοφία δαιμονιώδης.

² Perhaps the same who is mentioned, in 2 Tim. iv. 14, with the surname "the coppersmith," as a personal antagonist of Paul. Others identify him with the Alexander of Acts xix. 33. Others still suppose these to have been three different persons.

ready to appeal to the authority of the Jewish apostles, particularly James and Cephas, and took the attitude of thorough hostility to Paul; so the heathen heretics, on the contrary, we are expressly told in 2 Peter iii. 16, caricatured and wrested statements of Paul, and in the second century went so far as to reject the whole Old Testament and all the New except Paul's writings. While the Judaizing tendency consists essentially in a narrow and slavish legalism; antinomianism, or an insolent, licentious freedom of spirit, is on the other hand the natural infirmity of heathenism and of the heresies arising from it. In the one case Christianity is compressed into too narrow limits and run into the mould of an exclusive sect; in the latter it is indefinitely expanded and deprived of all fixed historical foundation. There the chief stress is laid on outward act, and salvation made to depend on the conscientious observance of certain commandments and ceremonies; here the spirit seeks salvation in a higher knowledge, in a peculiar wisdom, and boldly breaks away from all shackles of the letter and all bonds of external authority. Hence the great apostasy, which at the date of the epistles to the Thesalonians (A.D. 53) had already begun (*ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται*), but was to develop itself in far greater strength in future, is styled by Paul the "mystery of lawlessness" (*μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας*, 2 Thess. ii. 7), and a presumptuous opposition to God and divine things.

It is undeniable that heathenism also gives birth to strictly ascetic tendencies. This we see, as at this day among the Hindoos, so in antiquity among the Essenes and Therapeutae, who, as already observed, went in their ascetism far beyond all Jewish precepts, and did so certainly under heathen influence; in the errorists of Paul's later epistles; and still more clearly in many Gnostic sects of the second century, and in the Manicheans, who were at once antinomian and ascetic, and even repudiated marriage as diabolical. But in the first place, this Gnostic asceticism was stretched to an altogether unnatural tension, and was based, as has been already remarked, on a fundamentally wrong, anti-scriptural, dualistic view of the world, which attributed the good creation of God to the sole agency of the devil. And secondly, it was intended to be the very means of releasing the spirit from all thralldom of divine or human authority, and hence very easily ran out into its direct opposite, excessive sensuality

and immorality, under the satanic pretence, that these did not at all affect the soul, which was exalted above all corporeal influences.

1. In tracing the several manifestations of the Gnostic and antinomian heathenism in the apostolic church, we meet first of all, even before the appearance of Paul, the magician *Simon*, of Samaria, who has been stigmatized, at least by the tradition of the church fathers, as the patriarch of all heretics, especially of the heathen Gnostics.¹ A great many fabulous stories, no doubt, were very early associated with this name, particularly in the Pseudoclementine writings, which pretend to relate many of his fortunes, his juggleries, and his frequent defeats in disputations, which the apostle Peter is said to have held with him in Cæsarea, Antioch, etc.² His historical existence, however, and one interview between him and Peter in Samaria, are put beyond all question by the eighth chapter of Acts; and the account there given of him³ makes it very easy to understand, how he might afterwards come to be regarded as the first representative of the Gnostic corruption of the Gospel, as well as of a revolting prostitution of the Christian name to selfish ends. In him first appears that characterless syncretism, for which there was a peculiar susceptibility in half-heathen and half-Jewish Samaria, in union with magical and theurgical arts, such as the conjuration of the dead and of demons by formulas of the Oriental and Greek theosophy. A similar combination of Gnosis and demonistic sorceries we observe in the Ephesian opponents of pure Chris-

¹ Thus Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.* lib. I. c. 27, § 4, says: "Omnes, qui quoquo modo adulterant veritatem et præconium ecclesiæ lædunt, Simonis Samaritani magi discipuli et successores sunt. Quamvis non confiteantur nomen magistri sui ad seductionem reliquorum; attamen illius sententiam docent: Christi quidem Jesu nomen tanquam irritamentum proferentes, Simonis autem impietatem varie introducentes mortificant multos, per nomen bonum sententiam suam male disperdentes et per dulcedinem et decorem nominis amarum et malignum principis apostasiæ serpentis venenum porrigentes eis." So in I. c. 23, § 2 (Simon, ex quo universæ hæreses substiterrunt), and in the preface to the second and third books. The old traditional accounts of Simon Magus receive additional confirmation by the lately discovered book of Hippolytus on heresies, comp. Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, I. p. 62, *et seq.* (Germ. ed.)

² On this point comp., among other works, that of Schliemann on the Clementines, p. 52, *et seq.*, 96, *et seq.* We have already remarked incidentally, § 167, that the Pseudoclementine Homilies, in their Ebionistic spirit, represent the apostle Paul under the figure of Simon, as properly the arch-heretic.

³ Comp. § 59.

tianity, whom Paul accordingly compares with the Egyptian magicians, Jannes and Jambres.¹ Of course the real substance of this chaotic mixture was heathenish, and its Christianity merely an assumed name and a hypocritical show. The opinion of the Samaritans respecting Simon, which was no doubt the mere echo of his own boastful declaration, that he was "the great power of God,"² itself suggests the Gnostic æons and emanations, those singular caricatures of the mystery of the incarnation. According to the statement of Irenæus, Simon gave himself out as the supreme power (*sublimissimam virtutem*), and blasphemously boasted, that he appeared in Samaria as Father, among the Jews as Son, and among the other nations as Holy Ghost.³ From these and other accounts it appears, that he wished to be regarded as an incarnation of the Deity, and was, therefore, in the proper sense, a false Christ and an antichrist. But of course no complete system should be attributed to him. The heretical elements lay as yet fermenting in a chaotic mass. Besides, the leading interest with him was not knowledge but filthy lucre; whence the traffic in spiritual offices (*simony*) to this day goes by his name.

Along with him tradition mentions also Dositheus and Menander (a disciple of Simon) as two Samaritan sect-founders of the first century. But these nowhere appear in the New Testament. The dissolute Gnostic sect of the Simonians, which maintained itself down to the third century, derived its name and origin from Simon Magus.

2. Antinomian tendencies might also very easily arise from another source, viz., a *misconception of Paul's doctrine* respecting

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 8. Comp. Exod. vii. 11, 22; viii. 6, *et seq.* See also Acts xix. 13, *et seq.*

² ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη, Acts viii. 10. According to Justin Mart., Simon was worshipped as the first God by nearly all the Samaritans, *Apol.* I. c. 26 (p. 68, ed. Otto); Σχεδὸν πάντες μὲν Σαμαρεῖς, ὀλίγοι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν ὡς τὸν πρῶτον θεὸν ἐκείνον ὁμολογοῦντες, ἐκείνον καὶ προσκυνοῦσι.

³ *Adv. Haer.* I. 23, § 1.—According to Jerome (*Comment. in Matt.* 24), Simon said of himself: "Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego paracletus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei." Of Justin's account (resting, it would seem, on a mistake) respecting the deification of Simon at Rome, we have already spoken at the close of § 93. Some modern scholars, as Windischmann (*Vindic. Petr.* p. 75, *et seq.*), Gfrörer (*Philo und die Alexandr. Theosophie*, II. p. 370, *et seq.*), and Thiersch (l. c. p. 291, *et seq.*), also Dr Burton, in his work on the Heresies of the Apost. Age (Lecture IV.), are again justly ascribing to this patriarch of heretics far greater historical significance than has been commonly attributed to him since Mosheim.

the abolition of the law as a letter, which “killeth,” respecting justification by faith and evangelical freedom; especially in so frivolous a city as Corinth, where many eagerly laid hold of every new doctrine, which they could hope to use as a cloak for their former dissolute conduct. Paul himself more than once disowns with indignation the inference charged upon him, in the shape of the infamous maxim: “Let us do evil that good may come,” or, “Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound.”¹ That some of his disciples carried the freedom of the Gospel to an extreme in practice, is particularly clear from the first epistle to the Corinthians. For in it he opposes, among other things, supercilious contempt for the conscientious and scrupulous Jewish Christians, participation in the pagan idolatrous feasts, lax ideas of chastity, and even profanation of the love-feasts by intemperance (comp. § 78). No doubt, indeed, these were primarily practical aberrations; but such are always more or less connected with corrupt principles. There already appeared also in the Corinthian church, in union with the party spirit, the rudiments of a proud Gnosis, so congenial to wisdom-seeking Greece.² Paul even found it necessary to come out against the public denial of the resurrection of the body (1 Cor. xv. 12, *et seq.*) This is not to be referred to Sadducism—otherwise, like our Lord, Matth. xxii. 23, *et seq.*, he would have refuted it from the Old Testament—but was connected with Greek philosophical scepticism (comp. Acts xvii. 32) and Gnostic spiritualism, and was perhaps allied with the doctrine of Hymeneus and Philetus, which was spreading like a canker (ὡς γάγγραινα) in Asia Minor: “The resurrection is already past” (2 Tim. ii. 18).³ Here lay, properly, the germ of the Docetistic denial of the true humanity of Christ. And as in general false spiritualism very frequently runs into gross formalism and materialism, so this limitation of the resur-

¹ Rom. iii. 8; vi. 1. Gal. ii. 17. Comp. 1 Peter ii. 16.

² 1 Cor. viii. 1. Comp. i. 18, *et seq.*; ii. 1, *et seq.*—Dr Burton also (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 84, *et seq.*) finds Gnostic elements already in the Corinthian church.

³ The later Gnostics likewise denied the resurrection, or understood by it merely the reception of their doctrine, thus identifying it with the idea of conversion. Comp. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* II. 31, § 2: “Esse autem resurrectionem a mortuis agnitionem ejus, quæ ab eis dicitur, veritatis,” I. 27, § 3; Tertullian: *De resurr.* c. 19; *Adv. Marc.* V. 10; and Epiphanius: *Hær.* XLII. 2. In general they placed the whole work of redemption merely in intelligence, in the higher Gnosis.

rection to the purely spiritual inward life might quite easily induce, especially among the common people, genuine Epicurean frivolity, whose maxim is : “ Let us eat and drink ; for to-morrow we die ” (1 Cor. xv. 32).

In his valedictory at Miletus and in the Pastoral Epistles Paul predicts, that these tendencies, already existing in embryo, would after his departure, in the “ last days,” acquire fearful strength.¹

3. The same prophecy, with an earnest reference to the approaching judgment, meets us in the *second* epistle of *Peter*, which he sent in the prospect of death (A.D. 64) to the churches of Asia Minor. At that time, however, the apostasy was already further developed ; and still more fully some years afterwards, when *Jude*, the brother of James the Just, with his eye upon these predictions of the apostles, addressed his epistle perhaps to the same churches. In these two documents, which form the natural transition from the last stadium of Paul’s labours to the Johannean age, and in this transitional character strongly evince their genuineness, evidently have in view heathen Gnostic errorists of grossly immoral principles (comp. § 92). These heretics had learned Christ, and received baptism and the forgiveness of sins, but had fallen back into heathen, nay, far worse than heathen vice, as the sow that is washed returns to her wallowing in the mire (2 Peter i. 9 ; ii. 20–22) ; though it would seem, they remained outwardly in the communion of the church, and even took part in the love-feasts of the Christians (Jude 12). Designed to be shining stars in the firmament of the church, they became by their unfaithfulness ignes fatui, such as rise from bogs and decoy the traveller into dangerous ways (ver. 13). They are classed with Cain, the fratricide, and Balaam, the deceiver of God’s people (2 Peter ii. 15 ; Jude 11). Going a step further than Hymeneus and Philetus, the deniers of the resurrection, they mocked at the second coming of Christ and the judgment (2 Peter iii. 4). They wrested the epistles of Paul into their service (iii. 16), turned the grace of God to lasciviousness, and abused the freedom of the Gospel for a cloak of wickedness (ii. 19 ; Jude 4).²

¹ Acts xx. 29, *et seq.* 1 Tim. iv. 1, *et seq.* 2 Tim. iii. 1, *et seq.* Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 7.

² Very obscure is the passage, 2 Peter ii. 10 : Δόξας οὐ τρέμουσι βλασφημοῦντες, comp. Jude 8 : Δόξας βλασφημοῦντες. The verse immediately following, about the dispute

4. The apostasy showed itself still more boldly in Asia Minor, during *John's* activity, in the last thirty years of the first century. While Paul and Peter had pointed forward to the "last times," John now said, with unmistakable reference to these previous prophecies—"Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know, that it is the last time" (1 John ii. 18). When he immediately adds (ver. 19): "They went out from us (from the outward communion of the church), but they were not of us (in spirit, in inward disposition); for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us"—he seems thereby to intimate, that these heretics had already separated themselves from the church, as was the case at all events at the date of the epistles of Ignatius, and in some instances even in the time of Paul (1 Tim. i. 20). Yet there must have been exceptions. For, so late as the end of the first century, the churches of Pergamus and Thyatira are censured in the Apocalypse, ii. 14-16, 20, for tolerating errorists in their bosom. Also in 2 John 9, 10, there is a warning against all intercourse with them, which might imply an approval of their principles.

It is asserted by Irenæus and other church fathers, and confirmed by the best modern expositors, that John, in his writings, particularly his epistles,¹ has Gnostic heretics in view. In their practical bearing these errorists were antinomian, and sundered religion from morality. They boasted of their knowledge of Christ and freedom from sin, yet kept not Christ's commands, and walked in darkness. Hence John, in his epistles, strenuously insists on the indissoluble connection of sanctification with faith in Christ, on walking in the light, on obedience to the commandments of God as the mark of true discipleship, and on

between the archangel Michael and Satan, sufficiently shows that *δόξας* must be understood, not of divine attributes, but of angels and higher spirits. Whether this blaspheming of dignities, however, refer to the Gnostic doctrine of the demiurge, or mean, in general, insolence in speculating on and condemning the higher world of spirits, cannot be certainly determined.

¹ 1 Ep. ii. 18, 19, 22, 23; iv. 3. 2 Ep. 7-11. Comp. § 104 and 106. Thiersch (p. 241) would make even the *εἰδωλα*, against which John warns his children at the close of his first epistle, to refer not to gods, properly speaking, but to those æons and unsubstantial ideas, which the Gnostics put in the place of the true incarnation. But this seems to us too forced.

daily purification from remaining sin.¹ In respect to theory, these heretics went so far as to deny the incarnation of the Son of God, which they had been prepared to do by the Gnostic scepticism as to the resurrection of the body and the second coming of Christ to judgment. As the apostle regards the mystery of the incarnation, or the true union of the divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ, as the centre of the Christian truth and the fundamental condition of our own reconciliation with God, he pronounces the denial of this truth the proper essence and distinctive mark of antichristian falsehood.² Into the details of this fundamental heresy he does not enter. His language is designedly general, and, in itself considered, may be referred as well to the Ebionistic (vulgar rationalistic) denial of Christ's divinity, as to the Docetistic (panteistic) denial of His true humanity, or to the intermediate errors. In fact, he even says, 1 John ii. 18 and 2 John 7, that *many* antichrists had arisen; and these surely did not all teach exactly the same thing; for it is the nature of heresy to be always arbitrarily changing its form. A credible tradition, however, since Irenæus, tells us that

¹ Comp. 1 John i. 6; ii. 4, 9, 18, *et seq.*; iii. 6, 8, 15; iv. 7, 8, 12, 16, etc.

² 1 Ep. ii. 22; iv. 1-3.—This unequivocal description of antichrist makes it simply an exegetical impossibility to refer the passages in question, in their original sense, to the papacy, as some Protestant controversialists, even so learned a one as Bishop Newton (*Dissertations on the Prophecies, revised by Dobson*. London, 1850, p. 410), have done. For the Pope has never denied the true humanity or the true divinity of Christ. It might rather be said, that the Roman system exaggerates the import of the doctrine of the incarnation, or at least materializes it, and draws unwarrantable inferences from it,—*e.g.*, the excessive veneration of Mary as the mother of God. At any rate, the errors of Romanism lie in an entirely different direction, that of legalistic, unevangelical Judaism (comp. § 168). That John here cannot possibly have the papacy in view, is shown also by the following arguments: (1) He is speaking, not of something future (which the papacy then was), but of something *present*, which “is even now already in the world,” and could be distinctly recognised by his readers by the above mark, 1 John iv. 3; ii. 18. 2 John vii. (2) He speaks not of one antichrist, but of *several*, which had gone out from the Christian communion, yet had never inwardly belonged to it, 1 John ii. 18, 19. Comp. 2 John vii. (πολλοὶ πλάνοι). (3) He is speaking of things, not in the Roman church, but in that of *Asia Minor*, in which he lived and laboured, and to which his epistles are addressed. To these add (4) the concurrent exposition of the church fathers, and the best Protestant commentators, who all refer the passages in hand to the Gnostic error. We may, to be sure, regard as antichristianity, in a general sense, all that runs counter to the doctrine and spirit of Christ, be it found in the Roman or the Protestant church. But then this is no direct exposition of the text before us. A distorted exegesis like this can do the papacy no harm, and only weakens the Protestant cause, which has otherwise no reason to fear on the field of Scripture.

the apostle had particularly in view the Judaizing Gnostic *Cerintus*, who appeared at the close of the first century in Asia Minor, not formally denying, indeed, either the earthly Jesus or the divine Christ (an æon or higher angel), but making them two separate and entirely different beings, and supposing a merely transient union of the two at the baptism in the Jordan, which was dissolved at the beginning of the passion.¹ Thus the man Jesus was merely the vehicle, which the redeeming Logos temporarily employed to reveal himself to the world. It is but a step from this to Docetism. To this dualistic separation of the two natures in Christ no doubt refers the very old but nevertheless incorrect reading of 1 John iv. 3—"Every spirit that *separateth* (λύει, instead of 'confesseth not') Jesus Christ."² Soon after the death of John, his disciples Ignatius and Polycarp, with the same weapons encountered Docetism, which originated in a heathen mode of thinking, and taught that the passion and death and the whole humanity of Christ were merely a deceptive appearance (δόκησις), an airy vision, an optical illusion, like the imaginary theophanies of the heathen mythologies.

5. A few remarks, in fine, on the *Nicolaitans*, and kindred heretics mentioned in the apocalyptic epistles.

These sprang, according to a credible tradition, from the Antiochian proselyte, Nicolas, one of the seven deacons of Jerusalem (Acts vi. 5), who apostatized from the truth and became the founder of an antinomian Gnostic sect.³ By the church of Ephe-

¹ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I. 26, § 1, and several other places. The statements of Irenæus, who ascribes to Cerintus the genuinely Gnostic doctrine of the demiurge, and a system pretty much like the Valentinian Gnosis, are certainly far more reliable than the later and, in some cases, discrepant accounts of Epiphanius respecting the same heresiarch; though we cannot now distinguish with certainty what Cerintus himself taught, and what his disciples afterwards added.

² Socrates (*H. E.* VII. 32) mentions the reading λύει as very old. The Vulgate also, several Latin fathers, and the Latin translator of Irenæus, read accordingly: "Qui solvit Jesum;" while almost all the Greek authorities have μὴ ὁμολογεῖν. Augustine unites both: "Qui solvit Jesum et negat in carnem venisse."

³ Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I. 26, § 3 (al. c. 27). So also Hippolytus (vid. Bunsen's *Hippol.* I. p. 73), Clement of Alexandria, and others. These testimonies are too clear and respectable to be lightly set aside, especially if we consider the strong tendency in the primitive church to venerate as saints, and glorify by legends, all the Christians named in the New Testament. This forbids our adopting the *allegorical* interpretation of the name, which Hengstenberg, strangely and from his position altogether inconsistently undervaluing these historical testimonies, has given in his work on Balaam, p. 20, *et seq.*, and his commentary on Rev. ii. 6 (vol. i. p. 171, *et seq.*)

sus they were hated and thrust out (Rev. ii. 6), but were tolerated by the church of Pergamos (ii. 15), which is on this account severely censured by the seer. Akin to these, no doubt, though not exactly identical, are the adherents of the doctrine of *Balaam* in Pergamos (ii. 14)¹ and of the false prophetess *Jezebel* in Thyatira (ii. 20, *et seq.*) They are represented as an altogether disorderly sect, seducing the Christians to participation in the idolatrous feasts of the pagans² and to unchastity, which had already appeared in the germ in the Corinthian church. Hence also they are denoted by the names of the two leading agents in contaminating the people of God, under the old dispensation, with the moral corruption and idolatry of heathendom. For Balaam, the seer of heathen growth, from base avarice, enticed the Israelites, through the daughters of Moab and Midian, to idolatry and fornication (Num. xxv.; comp. xxxi. 16); and the heathen Jezebel, Ahab's wife, murdered the prophets of the Lord, and set up idolatry in Israel. This immorality was united with pretended inspirations from above (whence the name prophetess) and knowledge of the depths of God, which, however, the seer with fearful irony calls "depths of Satan."³ These heretics

This divine considers the name Nicolaus not a proper name, but a symbolical term, the Greek translation of Balaam, misleader or corrupter of the people, from—נִלְכָּץ or נִלְכָּץ, *to devour, to corrupt*, and עַם, *people*. But in the first place, this derivation cannot be even philologically vindicated. For Nicolaus means people-conqueror, which is by no means synonymous with people-misleader. To derive Balaam from נִלְכָּץ and עַם, *lord of the people*, or from the Chaldaic, נִלְכָּץ, *vicit*, would bring us nearer an identity of the terms. But in neither case would the reference have been intelligible to the Greek readers of the Revelation without further explanation. And in the second place, this interpretation is contradicted by Rev. ii. 14, 15, where the Nicolaitans are evidently distinguished from the Balaamites, however near akin they may have been in doctrine and practice. When Hengstenberg asserts in support of his explanation, that none but symbolical names occur in the Apocalypse, he is evidently wrong; for not only the name of the author, but also the names of the Jews, ii. 9, and of the seven churches are all to be taken as proper names.

¹ Peter also (2 Epistle ii. 15) and Jude (ver. 11) compare the dissolute Gnostics, whom they attack, with Balaam.

² Εἰδωλόθυτα φαγεῖν. This inconsiderate eating of meat offered to idols was even later considered a mark of the antinomian Gnostics. Valentinus and his disciples engaged in this practice to escape the persecution of the heathens.

³ Ἐγνώσαν τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ, ii. 24. The following ὡς λέγουσιν, refers only to ἔγνων τὰ βάθη, of which they boasted, and not to τοῦ σατανᾶ. So Bengel also explains the passage—"The false teachers said that the things they taught were *deep* things. This the Lord concedes, but with the qualification, that they were not divine but satanic depths; just as He allows the Jews, ver. 9, the name of a synagogue, but calls

taught, undoubtedly, that a man must make the whole circuit of sensuality before he could be rightly master of it; that he should unblushingly abandon himself to his lusts, since they concerned only the body, and the free spirit was as little affected by them as solid gold by filth. These horrible principles, which brought disgrace and odium upon the Christian name, were actually taught and put in practice by several Gnostic sects in the second century, and particularly by the Nicolaitans. Even the ex-deacon, Nicolas, is represented by Irenæus, Epiphanius, and Jerome as a formal antinomian; but by Clement of Alexandria as a rigid ascetic, abstaining from intercourse with his wife, and enjoining severe treatment of the flesh,¹ which was afterwards taken by his disciples in the sense of antinomian licentiousness. If the latter account is correct, we have here an example of the affinity between unnatural asceticism and unbridled sensuality, to which the history of monasticism furnishes so many parallels. The relation of the Nicolaitans to Nicolas may have been precisely the same as that of the Simonians to Simon Magus, or of the Cerinthians to Cerinthus.

A review of this whole chapter suggests several important inferences, which, however, we can only briefly point out.

1. It is an utterly groundless assumption, that the apostolic church was free from all error in theory or practice, and fully came up to the glorious ideal of the kingdom of Christ.² On the contrary, no little to our consolation and encouragement, the church even then had to contend with as great difficulties, without and within, as in any succeeding period. She was, in the full sense of the word, militant; and she can accomplish her

it a synagogue of Satan." Hengstenberg, *ad. loc.*, explains the passage differently.

¹ Δεῖ καταχεῖσθαι τῇ σαρκί. Comp. Neander's *Kirchengesch.* II. p. 781.

² Conybeare and Howson, *l. c.* I. p. 488. "It is painful to be compelled to acknowledge among the Christians of the Apostolic Age the existence of so many forms of error and sin. It was a pleasing dream which presented the primitive church as a society of angels; and it is not without a struggle that we bring ourselves to open our eyes and behold the reality. But yet it is a higher feeling which bids us thankfully to recognise the truth that 'there is no partiality with God,' that He has never supernaturally coerced any generation of mankind into virtue, nor rendered schism and heresy impossible in any age of the church."

final victory, and reach her perfect unity, universality, and holiness, only through a long and unremitting struggle against sin and error without and within.

2. It is only in view of the fearful power of the corruption with which Judaism and Heathenism, in the form of heresy, and thus under colour of the Christian name and of Christian ideas, threatened the church, that we can duly appreciate the supernatural energy and glory of this church, and the full meaning of Christ's promises of His uninterrupted presence and protection.

3. These early theoretical and practical distortions of the Christian truth likewise teach us, that the *written* inventory of them by infallible organs of the Holy Ghost—the literature of the New Testament—was, and still is, exceedingly important, nay, absolutely necessary, for the preservation of pure Christianity. For the same errors in various forms and modifications continually return.

4. The controversy of the apostles with these heretics was free from all personalities—only four, Simon Magus, Hymeneus, Alexander, and Philetus, being mentioned by name,—teaching, that we should hate and firmly oppose error, as sin, but love errorists, as sinners, and seek to reclaim them.

5. The apostolic controversialists do not waste their strength on the details of a heretical system, but with wonderful discernment and truly massive strokes lay open the real kernel, the deep moral root of the whole; and this is in all ages the same.

6. This very generalness and depth, however, makes the writings in question inexhaustibly fruitful and applicable to all times. The same Jewish and heathen errors perpetually repeat themselves in the church under a thousand different forms, but from the armory of the apostolic writings the church may always draw the mightiest weapons for opposing them, till the truth celebrates her last and highest triumph.

§ 170. *Typical Import of the Apostolic Church.*

In taking leave of the first and most important period of ecclesiastical history, we append a few hints respecting the typical import of the apostolic church; not as pertaining to church history itself, but as touching the philosophy of it.

It has been suggested in various quarters by very distinguished

scholars with more or less distinctness, that the three leading apostles, *Peter*, *Paul*, and *John*, are to be taken as types and representatives of so many ages of the church, viz., the age of *Catholicism*, the age of *Protestantism*, and that of the *ideal church of the future*.¹ We may therefore the more freely venture to express in our own way a similar view, which has, to us at least, much that is elevating and encouraging in midst of the confusion and distraction of the church; though for some reasons we cannot expect it to meet with much sympathy at the present time.

We start from the general position, which we endeavoured more fully to establish in the Introduction,—that the history of the church, in its real central current of motion and life, is in all its parts reasonable and worthy of God; that it is a continuous self-vindication of Christianity, an unbroken anthem of praise to eternal wisdom and love; that even in the times comparatively darkest the Lord has literally kept His precious promise to be with His church always, even unto the end of the world. How, otherwise, could that church be described by the inspired apostle as the body of Jesus Christ, the fulness of Him, that filleth all in all?

In this gradual unfolding of the new creation, of the theanthropic life of Jesus Christ—in this great epic of the world's

¹ This opinion was first put forth in the Middle Ages by the prophesying monk, Joachim of Flora, and has been substantially favoured in modern times by eminent philosophers, as Steffens, Schelling, and Von Schaden, and more or less by learned and pious theologians, as Neander, Ullmann, Schmieder, Lange, Thiersch, and others. Comp. also my tract: *The Principle of Protestantism, translated by Dr Nevin*, 1845, p. 174, *et seq.* It is remarkable that even a Roman Catholic divine, as I have just found, approaches this truly liberal and Protestant view. Professor J. Ant. Bernh. Lutterbeck, in his learned work *Die N. Testamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, oder Untersuchungen über das Zeitalter der Religionswende* (1852), thus speaks of the relations of St Peter to St Paul (II. 166, *et seq.*): “While in the normal condition the pre-eminence of Peter represents the principle of *order*, and the independence of Paul, the principle of *freedom* in the church, we may conceive of abnormities on both sides, in which the supposed order degenerates into petrification” (—is this a conscious or an unconscious play on the word Peter?—), “the supposed freedom into dissolution and evaporation of all the contents of Christianity; where the former leads to arbitrary tyranny, the latter to rebellion and revolution. History records innumerable instances of such aberrations, from the collision at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11, *et seq.*) down to the present time.” If similar views should become general in the Roman church, the final reconciliation of Catholicism and Protestantism would not be such an absolute impossibility as it now appears to be.

Redeemer, this triumphal procession of the Saviour through humanity—the apostolic period, “the century of miracles,” occupies a position altogether peculiar.

It is not merely one period among others, but the grounding and preformative beginning, the model church, which conditions and governs all subsequent developments; whose spirit perpetually breathes new life, presenting to every age its particular problem, and imparting the power to solve it. Four thousand years were requisite to prepare the way for the manifestation of the Eternal Life in human flesh, to bring up to the horizon the central Sun of the world's history. For nearly two thousand years that Sun has shone upon humanity to an ever-growing extent, calling forth a series of thoughts, words, deeds, and events, almost beyond comprehension. But everything, which has occurred or is yet to occur, in the church, will be only the expansion of the infinite fulness, which dwelt from the first in Jesus Christ. The church will outwardly and inwardly advance, as heretofore; but every step will be conditioned by a deeper penetration into the apostolic writings, and into the spirit of the Lord, which breathes in them. In the apostolic church and its sacred records are drawn the outlines of the whole course of history. There are prefigured all future developments; and that in a far higher sense, than the one, in which Judaism was a shadow of good things to come.

This is precisely what we mean by the *typical* import of the apostolic church. In a rapid, superhuman course that church virtually went through the entire process, which subsequently unfolds itself in larger cycles in a series of centuries. It contained in embryo all succeeding periods, and all the principal phases of doctrine and the various dangerous tendencies, which meet us in later times. When the last age shall close with the visible return of the Lord, we shall be able to say: In the apostolic church was enveloped the church of all subsequent periods; church history is developed from the apostolic church: the apostolic church was a prophecy; church history is its fulfilment.

In the specific application of this principle we must, indeed, use great caution, never forgetting, that history can be perfectly understood only at the end of the process of its development. Only when we look back from the incarnation, can we clearly

understand ancient history in its inmost significance, as a preparation—partly negative, partly positive—for the appearance of Christ; a voice in the wilderness: “prepare ye the way of the Lord.” So shall we see church history in a perfect light only when we stand on the mount of Christ’s second coming, and of his triumphant Zion, and look back upon all its toilsome path of conflict and controversy from the beginning to the glorious goal. Yet even in partial knowledge there is great spiritual profit and delight.

The course of church history has thus far evidently lain through the colossal counter-movements of Catholicism and Protestantism; the chronological turning-point being the sixteenth century. In these respectively, we think, may be discerned the essential features of the Jewish and Gentile Christianity, which divided the apostolic period. And thus it is by no means a mere chance, that the Roman church, which has most rigidly carried out the principle of Catholicism, appeals by preference to Peter as the chief of the apostles and rock of the church, and to the epistle of James in particular as the ground of her doctrine of justification; while the reformers as a body, and especially Luther, adhere closely to Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, and draw from his epistles to the Romans and the Galatians the main features of their theology, as well as the best weapons of their opposition to papal tyranny.

Like Jewish Christianity, Catholicism views the Christian religion, in close connection with the Old Testament, chiefly under the aspect of legal authority and of objectivity. Hence it is strictly conservative, making great account of consistency with the past, of forms and works, of outward, visible unity and conformity. The partial justness and relative necessity of this view cannot be denied. And it takes the precedence in time, because the law is a schoolmaster to lead to Christ; maternal authority is the preparation for the freedom and independence of manhood. But as Jewish Christianity was liable to misapprehend and disregard the Christian religion in the other correlative aspect of evangelical freedom, advocated by Paul, and to paralyze Christianity by degrading it into bondage to law—which was actually done in the Judaizing heresy; so Catholicism contracted a like infirmity, and sank in manifold respects to the level of carnal

Judaism. "The Catholic church—especially as she appears since her union with the Roman imperial power and the reception of all nations into her bosom—what is she but at once a sublime re-establishment of the Old Testament theocracy on Christian soil—divinely permitted, yet not on that account perpetually authorized—and an attempt to anticipate the future glorious kingdom of Jesus Christ, in which He shall reign over the regenerate earth and sanctified humanity?"¹ We may go further, and ask: Has not the Catholic church, like Peter, often denied her Lord? Has she not, like Peter at Antioch, accommodated herself too much to the prejudices of the weak? As her patron drew the sword against Malchus, has she not likewise, in carnal zeal for the glory of her Lord, drawn the sword against all heretics and schismatics, injurious or harmless; forgetting the word: "My kingdom is not of this world?" and: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Will she ever, like Peter, in humble consciousness of guilt, go out and weep bitterly, till she find forgiveness at the foot of the cross?

Against this Judaistic extreme, the tyranny, outward legalism, and self-righteousness of the Roman Catholic system, the powerful mind of Paul, after long preparation, re-acted in the Reformation; as formerly in the apostolic council at Jerusalem, in the scene at Antioch, and in his masterly epistles. Besides the whole legal discipline of the Middle Age tended mightily towards this result as the ripe fruit of its conflicts. In like manner the Mosaic law and ceremonial worship pointed to the new dispensation of the spirit; and the parental training looks beyond itself to mature age and self-government. Protestantism, in its purest forms, conceives Christianity as a new creation, as evangelical freedom, as divine sonship, as a direct and personal relation of the soul to Christ. So far as it agrees in this with the Gentile apostle, it is a great advance in the history of the church; and as to its element of positive truth it can never perish. But on the other hand, it has in the main, in the course of its development, fallen over to the opposite extreme of a licentious speculation and endless sectarian division. In its zeal to purge the

¹ Thiersch: *Versuch zur Herstellung*, etc. p. 244.

sanctuary it has demolished many a useful barrier, done manifold injustice to tradition and history, and in the heat of passionate controversy incurred the guilt of ingratitude to the Catholic church, which, say what we will, was its mother, and trained its heroes for reformers. Nay, more. A remarkable analogy may be traced between the old pseudo-Pauline Gnosticism and the fearful power of modern infidelity; especially the blasphemous, destructional systems of Pantheism and Atheism. These systems have attained their most mature, scientific development in the bosom of German Protestantism, and appeal to the Reformation for their right to protest against Christ and His apostles, as formerly Marcion and the Gnostics appealed to Paul. Who, that considers the Holy Scriptures and the idea of the one, holy, Catholic apostolic church, will further venture to justify the extreme individualism, the numberless divisions, and conflicting party interests, into which at present even the best positively Christian powers of Protestantism seem to be almost hopelessly rent? Who, in the face of these facts, will deny that the Protestantism of this day is as much one-sided, diseased, and in need of reformation, as was the Catholicism of the sixteenth century?

This reformation, however, we look for, not in return to a position already transcended—for history can never go backwards—but in the final reconciliation of Catholicism and Protestantism, the blending of the truth and virtues of both, without their corresponding errors and defects, in the ideal church of the future,—forming, not a *new* church, but the final perfect product of that of the present and the past. For the type of this third age we have John, the apostle of love and consummation, the disciple who, according to the mysterious words, John xxi. 22, tarries till the Lord returns. And that, which is to introduce this age, is the perfect understanding of John's conception of Christ, the eternal Word manifest in the flesh; and the diffusion of his spirit of love, that surest mark of genuine discipleship (John xiii. 35), that cardinal virtue, which never fails (1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13). The question of the person and work of Christ and the church question are at bottom one. The answer to the latter depends on that given to the former, as cer-

tainly as the body on the head, which rules, and the soul, which animates it. For in Jesus Christ, the God-man, the centre of the moral universe, we have the solution of every enigma of history. In Him, and in Him alone, breaks forth the fountain of truth and of life-everlasting.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

<i>Years after Christ's Birth.</i>		<i>Cotemporary Roman Emperors.</i>
A.D. 30	Foundation of the Christian Church, by the Outpouring of the Holy Ghost.	TIBERIUS, A.D. 14-37.
" 30-40	Spread and Persecution of Christianity amongst the Jews. Stephen the first Martyr (37). The Gospel in Samaria. Conversion of Cornelius. Founding of the Mixed Congregation at Antioch. Barnabas. Preparation of Gentile Missions.	CALIGULA, " 37-41.
" 37	Conversion of Paul.	
" 40	Paul's first Journey to Jerusalem after his conversion. Sojourn at Tarsus and afterwards at Antioch (Acts xi. 26).	CLAUDIUS, " 41-54.
" 44	Persecution of the Church at Jerusalem. Martyrdom of James the Elder. Peter's Imprisonment and Deliverance. He leaves Palestine. (Hypothesis of his first visit to Rome founded on Acts xii. 17?) Paul's second Journey to Jerusalem, in company with Barnabas, as Delegate of the Congregation at Antioch, to relieve the Famine.	
" 45-49	Paul's First great Missionary Journey, with Barnabas and Mark. (Cyprus, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, return to Antioch in Syria).	
" 50	Apostolic Council at Jerusalem. Conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. Paul's Third Journey to Jerusalem, with Barnabas and Titus. Settlement of the difficulty; agreement between the Jewish and Gentile Apostles. Paul's return to Antioch. His collision with Peter and Barnabas, and temporary separation from the latter.	
" 51	Paul's Second Missionary Journey, from Antioch to Asia Minor (Cilicia, Lycaonia, Galatia, Troas), and Greece, (Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth).	
" 52-53	Paul at Corinth (a year and a half). First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians.	
" 54	Paul's Fourth Journey to Jerusalem (Spring). Short stay at Antioch. His Third Missionary Tour (Autumn).	NERO, " 54-63.
" 54-57	Paul at Ephesus (three years). Epistle to the Galatians (56). Excursion to Macedonia, Corinth, and Crete (not mentioned in the Acts). First Epistle to Timothy (?). Return to Ephesus. First Epistle to the Corinthians (Spring 57).	
" 57	Paul's departure from Ephesus (Summer) to Macedonia. Second Epistle to the Corinthians.	
" 57-58	Paul's Third Sojourn at Corinth (three months). His Epistle to the Romans.	
" 58	Paul's Fifth and Last Journey to Jerusalem (Spring), where he is arrested and sent to Cæsarea.	
" 58-60	Paul's Captivity at Cæsarea. Testimony before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa. (The Gospel of Luke and the Acts commenced at Cæsarea, and concluded at Rome.)	
" 60-61	Paul's Voyage to Rome (Autumn). Shipwreck at Malta. Arrival at Rome (Spring 61).	
" 61-63	Paul's Captivity at Rome. Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, Philemon, Second Epistle to Timothy. (Hypothesis of a Second Roman Captivity, and Intervening Missionary Journeys to the East and to Spain?)	
" 66-64	Peter's visit to Rome. His First and Second Epistles.	
" 64	Conflagration at Rome (July). Neronian Persecution of the Christians. Martyrdom of Paul and Peter.	
" 64 69	Epistle to the Hebrews (by Paul and Luke?). Martyrdom of James the Just. Epistle of Jude.	
" 70	Destruction of Jerusalem.	
" 70-100	John's Labours in Asia Minor. His Gospel and Epistles. His Exile at Patmos, under the Domitian Persecution (95). The Apocalypse. Return to Ephesus (96), and Death (circa 100).	

ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

A

ACHAIA, churches of, i. 343.
 Acts of the Apostles, ii. 294, *et seq.*
 Agabus, the prophet, i. 282, 355.
 Alexander, Dr J. A., i. 156.
 Alzog, i. 72.
 Ananias, ii. 166, *et seq.*
 Andrew, ii. 45.
 Angels of the Apocalypse, ii. 221, *et seq.*
 Anointing with oil, ii. 276.
 Antioch, church of, i. 264, and *passim*.
 Apocalypse of St John, ii. 82, *et seq.*
 298, *et seq.*
 Apollos, i. 334, *et seq.*
 Apostles' Creed, ii. 256, 312.
 Apostles, their personal character and
 piety, ii. 104, *et seq.*, their office,
 ii. 193, *et seq.*
 Apostolic church, its general charac-
 ter, i. 219, *et seq.*
 Apostolic theology, ii. 310, *et seq.*
 Aquila, i. 320, 326.
 Aratus, i. 318.
 Aristotle, i. 179.
 Arnold, i. 82.
 Athens, Paul at, i. 313, *et seq.*

B

BAPTISM, ii. 252, *et seq.*, of infants,
 259, *et seq.*
 Barnabas, i. 284, *et seq.*, 304.
 Baronius, i. 67.
 Bartholomew, ii. 46.
 Basnage, i. 80.
 Baur, i. 129, *et seq.*, 273, 296, *et seq.*
 310 and *passim*.
 Bayle, i. 81.
 Beda Venerabilis, i. 65.

Berea, i. 313.
 Bishops, ii. 204, *et seq.*
 Bossuet, i. 70.
 Burton, Dr, i. 150.

C

CÆSAREA, i. 259, 355, 366.
 Calist, i. 80.
 Celibacy, ii. 117, *et seq.*
 Cerinthus, ii. 379.
 Charisms, ii. 141, *et seq.*
 Charity, ii. 158, *et seq.*
 Christian ministry, ii. 173.
 Christian name, origin of, i. 265, *et seq.*
 Christ Jesus, character of, ii. 101, *et seq.*
 Christology of Paul, i. 381, 384 ; of
 the Gospels, ii. 283 ; of Peter, 329 ;
 of John, 346.
 Christ party at Corinth, i. 336, *et seq.*
 Church, general idea of, i. 8, ii. 178 ;
 development of, i. 11 ; relation to
 the world, i. 15 ; Paul's view of, i.
 382.
 Church History, general definition, i.
 19 ; relation to other theological
 sciences, i. 22 ; branches of, i. 23 ;
 sources of, i. 32 ; method of, i. 39 ;
 ages and periods of, i. 42 ; uses of,
 i. 55.
 Civil life, influence of Christianity
 upon, ii. 134.
 Clement of Rome on Paul's captivity
 and martyrdom, i. 397, *et seq.*
 Colossian errorists, i. 379 ; ii. 362.
 Colossians, epistle to the, i. 377, *et seq.*
 Communion, the holy, ii. 272, *et seq.*
 Confirmation, rite of, ii. 275.

Corinth, congregation of, i. 320, *et seq.* 332, *et seq.*; parties, 334, *et seq.*
 Corinthians, first epistle to the, i. 332, *et seq.*; second epistle, 342.
 Cornelius, i. 257, *et seq.*
 Council of Jerusalem, i. 297, *et seq.*
 Cramer, i. 89.
 Crete, i. 389.
 Cynic philosophy, i. 177.

D

DEACONESSES, ii. 218, *et seq.*
 Deacons, ii. 215, *et seq.*
 Development, i. 11, 95, 107; ii. 176, *et seq.*
 Dionysius Areopagita, i. 319.
 Discipline of the Church, ii. 164, *et seq.*
 Doctrine History, i. 25.
 Domitian, ii. 61, *et seq.*
 Dorner, i. 143.

E

EASTER, ii. 244.
 Ebionism, ii. 354.
 Elders, ii. 204, *et seq.*; teaching and ruling elders, ii. 212.
 Election of church officers, ii. 180, *et seq.*
 Engelhardt, i. 106.
 Ephesians, epistle of Paul to the, i. 380; of John in the Apocalypse, ii. 94.
 Ephesus, Paul at, i. 326, *et seq.*
 Epicurean philosophy, i. 176.
 Episcopacy, ii. 225.
 Essenes, i. 207; ii. 358.
 Eusebius, i. 62, and *passim.*
 Evagrius, i. 63.
 Evangelical catholic historiography, i. 102, *et seq.*
 Evangelists, ii. 201, *et seq.*

F

FAMILY, influence of Christianity upon the, ii. 111, *et seq.*
 Felix, i. 366.
 Festivals, ii. 243, *et seq.*
 Festus, i. 368.
 Flacius, i. 78.
 Fleury, i. 70.

G

GALATIA, churches of, i. 306, 331.
 Galatians, epistles to the, i. 331.

Gentile Christianity, ii. 315, *et seq.*
 Gfrörer, i. 104.
 Gibbon, i. 99, *et seq.*
 Gieseler, i. 34, 98, 115, and *passim.*
 Gnosticism and Gnostics, i. 389; ii. 361, 369.
 Government of church, ii. 173.
 Gospels, ii. 283, *et seq.*
 Greek culture and literature in its relation to Christianity, i. 170, *et seq.*
 Gregory of Tours, i. 65.
 Guericke, i. 104, 106.

H

HAGENBACH, i. 126.
 Hase, i. 104, 105, 127.
 Haymo, i. 65.
 Heathenism, i. 165, *et seq.*
 Hebrews, epistle to the, ii. 341, *et seq.*
 Hefele, i. 72.
 Hegel, i. 107, 129.
 Hellenistic dialect, ii. 304.
 Hellenists, i. 215.
 Henke, i. 97.
 Herder, i. 109.
 Heresy, ii. 352.
 Herod Agrippa I. i. 202.
 Herod Agrippa II. i. 369.
 Herod the Great, i. 201, *et seq.*
 History, idea of, i. 1; factors of, i. 4.
 Hottinger, i. 80.
 Hundeshagen, i. 126.
 Hurter, i. 72.
 Hymns, ii. 250, *et seq.*

I

IMMERSION, ii. 252, *et seq.*
 Imperfections of apostolic church, ii. 160.
 Infidelity, i. 216.
 Irvingite view on the perpetuity of the spiritual gifts, ii. 144, and of the apostolic offices, 198.
 Isaiah, i. 200.

J

JAMES the Elder, the son of Zebedee, i. 283.
 James the Just, the brother of the Lord, i. 297, *et seq.*; i. 357, ii. 35, *et seq.*; his epistle, ii. 40, *et seq.*; his doctrinal system, ii. 325, *et seq.*; relation to Paul, i. 326.

James the Less, the son of Alpheus, ii. 48.
 Jarvis, i. 152.
 Jerusalem, congregation of, i. 246, *et seq.*, i. 283, ii. 40; destruction of, ii. 48, *et seq.*
 Jewish Christianity, i. 294, *et seq.*, i. 391, ii. 315, *et seq.*
 Jewish religion, i. 165, *et seq.*, i. 204, *et seq.*
 Jews, their political condition at the time of Christ, i. 201; their religious condition, i. 204.
 John the apostle and evangelists, his education, ii. 55; his apostolic labours, ii. 58; his banishment to Patmos, ii. 61; his return to Ephesus, ii. 66; his death, ii. 68; his character and position in the apostolic church, ii. 68, 109; his writings, ii. 74; his gospel, ii. 76 and 287; his epistles, ii. 79; his Apocalypse, ii. 82 and ii. 298; his doctrinal system, ii. 346; his relation to the ideal church, ii. 381.
 John the Baptist, the representative of the law and the prophecy, i. 200; disciples of at Ephesus, i. 328.
 Josephus, ii. 50, *et seq.* and *passim*.
 Judaizers, ii. 355.
 Judas Lebbaeus, ii. 48.
 Jude, epistle of, ii. 332.
 Justification by faith, i. 349, Paul's doctrine of, ii. 335, *et seq.*

K

KAYE, i. 155.
 Kurtz, i. 104, 126.

L

LAODICEA, church of, ii. 94.
 Laurentius Valla, i. 65.
 Law of the O. T., i. 195, *et seq.*
 Leo, Henry, i. 139, *et seq.*
 Lindner, i. 104, 126.
 Lingard, i. 73.
 Luke, gospel of, ii. 286, Acts, ii. 294, *et seq.*; doctrinal system, ii. 341, *et seq.*
 Lydia, i. 309.

M

MAGDEBURG CENTURIES, i. 78.
 Marheineke, i. 138.

Mark, gospel of, ii. 285, 332.
 Marriage, ii. 117, *et seq.*
 Mary, the mother of Christ, i. 201, *et seq.*; ii. 58.
 Matter, i. 147.
 Matthew, ii. 47; gospel of, ii. 285, 332.
 Matthias, ii. 48.
 Merle D'Aubigne, i. 147.
 Miletus, Paul at, i. 352.
 Milman, i. 150.
 Milner, i. 84.
 Ministerial office, ii. 173, *et seq.*
 Miracles, ii. 156, *et seq.*
 Möhler, i. 72.
 Mosheim, i. 87.
 Münscher, i. 93.

N

NATALIS ALEXANDER, i. 69.
 Nathanael, ii. 46.
 Neander, i. 44, 112, *et seq.* and *passim*.
 Neo-Platonism, i. 183.
 Nero, ii. 28, *et seq.*
 Nevin, i. 157.
 Newman, i. 73, 149.
 New Testament, literature of the, ii. 281, *et seq.*
 Nicolaitans, ii. 377.

O

OLD TESTAMENT, revelation of, i. 195, *et seq.*
 Onesimus, i. 383.
 Ordination, ii. 180, 275.

P

PALMER, i. 152.
 Papacy, ii. 31, *et seq.*
 Patmos, ii. 62.
 Paul, his name, origin and education, i. 267, *et seq.*; his conversion, i. 271; preparation for his apostolic labours, i. 278; first journey to Jerusalem, i. 279; second journey to Jerusalem, i. 282; first missionary tour, i. 284; third journey to Jerusalem, i. 288; private conference with the apostles, i. 293; public council, i. 297; collision with Peter and Barnabas at Antioch, i. 302; second missionary tour, i. 305; founds the congregations in Phrygia and Galatia, i. 306; in Philippi, i. 307; in Thes-

- salonica, i. 312 ; in Berea, i. 313 ; preaches at Athens, i. 313 ; labours at Corinth, i. 320 ; writes to the Thessalonians, i. 323 ; fourth journey to Jerusalem and Antioch, i. 324 ; third missionary tour, i. 326 ; labours three years at Ephesus, i. 326 ; writes to the Galatians and to the Corinthians, i. 331 ; revisits Greece, i. 342 ; writes to the Romans, i. 348 ; fifth and last journey to Jerusalem, i. 351 ; farewell address at Miletus, i. 352 ; his arrest at Jerusalem, i. 356 ; his defence before the Sanhedrim, i. 363 ; his captivity at Cæsarea, i. 366 ; before Felix, i. 366 ; before Festus and Agrippa, i. 368 ; journey to Rome, i. 371 ; shipwreck at Malta, 372 ; captivity at Rome, i. 373 ; writes to the Colossians, i. 377 ; to the Ephesians, i. 380 ; to Philemon, i. 383 ; to the Philippians, i. 383 ; hypothesis of the second imprisonment, i. 384 ; the pastoral epistles, i. 391 ; his martyrdom, i. 401 ; his moral character, ii. 108 ; his style of writing, ii. 307 ; his doctrinal system, ii. 334 ; his relationship to Protestantism, ii. 381.
- Pentecost, birthday of the church, i. 227, *et seq.* ; celebration of, ii. 244, *et seq.*
- Pergamos, church of, ii. 94.
- Persecution, i. 24 ; of Nero, i. 403, *et seq.* of Domitian, ii. 61, *et seq.*
- Peter, his sermon on the day of Pentecost, i. 241, *et seq.* ; his activity, imprisonment and defence, i. 246 ; confirms the Samaritans, i. 255 ; baptizes Cornelius, i. 263 ; is imprisoned again under Herod Agrippa, but miraculously delivered and leaves Jerusalem, i. 283 ; attends the apostolic council, i. 293 ; his collision with Paul at Antioch, i. 302 ; his personal character, ii. 1 ; his general position in church history, ii. 4 ; his later labours, ii. 9 ; his first epistle, ii. 10 ; his second epistle, ii. 15 ; his residence in Rome, ii. 17 ; his martyrdom, ii. 29 ; his doctrinal system, ii. 328 ; his relation to Catholicism, ii. 31 and 381.
- Pfaff, i. 89.
- Pharisees, i. 204 ; ii. 357.
- Philadelphia, church of, ii. 93, *et seq.*
- Philemon, ii. 383.
- Philip, the apostle, ii. 45.
- Philip, the deacon and evangelist, i. 253, *et seq.*
- Philippi, congregation of, i. 307, *et seq.*
- Philippians, epistle of Paul to the, i. 383, *et seq.*
- Philo, i. 211, *et seq.*
- Philostorgius, i. 63.
- Planck, i. 90.
- Plato and Platonism, i. 178, *et seq.*
- Plutarch, i. 167, 180.
- Pragmatic method, i. 85, 90, 93.
- Prayer, ii. 248, *et seq.*
- Presbyters, ii. 204, *et seq.*
- Priesthood, universal, ii. 186, *et seq.*
- Priestley, i. 101.
- Primacy of Peter, ii. 4, 31, *et seq.*
- Priscilla, i. 321, 326.
- Prophets and Prophecy of the O. T. i. 198, *et seq.* ; of the N. T. ii. 152, *et seq.*, 200, *et seq.*, 298, *et seq.*
- Proselytes, i. 210.
- Protestant historiography, i. 75.
- Puseyism, i. 152.

R

- RANKE, i. 127.
- Rationalistic historiography, i. 93, *et seq.*, i. 127, *et seq.*
- Religion, its position in history, i. 163.
- Rohrbacher, i. 71.
- Roman Catholic historiography, i. 66.
- Roman congregation, i. 346, *et seq.*
- Romans, epistle of Paul to the, i. 344, *et seq.*
- Rome, its universal dominion, a preparation for Christianity, i. 184, *et seq.*
- Rothe, i. 140, *et seq.*

S

- SACRED PLACES, ii. 233.
- Sacred Times, ii. 234.
- Sadducees, i. 206.
- Sardis, church of, ii. 94.

Sarpi, i. 69.
 Saul, see Paul.
 Schenkel, i. 126.
 Schleiermacher, i. 111.
 Schmidt, i. 97.
 Schröckh, i. 89.
 Schwegler, i. 129.
 Scriptores Byzantini, i. 64.
 Scriptures, the reading of, ii. 248 ;
 of the N. T. ii. 282, *et seq.*
 Semler, i. 93.
 Sermon, ii. 247.
 Seven churches of Asia Minor, ii. 92,
 et seq.
 Silas, i. 305.
 Simon Magus, i. 254 ; ii. 23 and
 372.
 Simon Zelotes, ii. 48.
 Skeptic philosophy, i. 176.
 Slavery, ii. 124, *et seq.*
 Smith, Professor, i. 156.
 Smyrna, church of, ii. 93.
 Socrates, the historian, i. 63.
 Socrates, the philosopher, i. 176.
 Song, ii. 250.
 Sozomenus, i. 63.
 Spanheim, i. 80.
 Spiritual gifts, ii. 141, *et seq.*
 Spittler, i. 91.
 Stephen, the first martyr, i. 249, *et*
 seq.
 Stoicism, i. 189, *et seq.*
 Strauss, i. 131.
 Sunday, ii. 237, *et seq.*
 Superstition, i. 216.
 Supper of the Lord, ii. 272, *et seq.*
 Support of the ministry, ii. 183.

T

TACITUS on the Neronian persecution,
 i. 404.
 Taylor, Isaac, i. 153.

Theodoret, i. 63.
 Theodorus, i. 63.
 Therapeutae, i. 214.
 Thessalonica, congregation of, i. 312,
 et seq.
 Thessalonians, Epistles of Paul to the,
 i. 323.
 Thiersch, i. 144, *et seq.* and *passim.*
 Thomas, ii. 46.
 Thyatira, church of, ii. 94.
 Tillemont, i. 70.
 Timothy, i. 306 ; ii. 206 ; epistles to,
 i. 389, *et seq.*
 Titus, i. 293 ; ii. 206 ; epistle to, i.
 390, *et seq.*
 Tongues, speaking with, and gift of,
 i. 233, *et seq.* ; ii. 147, *et seq.*
 Troas, i. 307.
 Trophimus, i. 362.

U

ULLMANN, i. 126.

V

VENEMA, i. 92.

W

WADDINGTON, i. 150.
 Walch, i. 89.
 Washing of Feet, ii. 274.
 Welsh, i. 151.
 Weismann, i. 87.
 Wieseler, i. 229, 281, 292, *et seq.*, 303
 and *passim.*
 Worship, ii. 229, *et seq.*

Y

YEARLY FESTIVALS, ii. 243.

Z

ZELLER, i. 128, *et seq.*

THE END.

BOUND BY
JOHN GRAY
DUNBURY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 049967885